NEW PUBLICATIONS.

1. SPEECH of the Right Hon. WILLIAM PITT, in the House of Commons, Thursday, January 31st, 1799, on offering to the House the Resolutions which he proposed as the Basis of an UNION between Great Britain and Ireland. SEVENTH EDITION. Price 1s. 6d.

2. SPEECH of the Right Hon. HENRY DUNDAS, in the House of Commons, Thursday, February 7th, 1799, on the subject of the LEGISLATIVE UNION with Ireland. THIRD EDITION. Price 1s.

3. SUBSTANCE of the SPEECH of the Right Hon. HENRY ADDINGTON, Speaker of the House of Commons, on the 12th February, 1799, in the Committee of the whole House, to whom his Majesty's most gracious Message of the 22d January, relative to an UNION between Great Britain and Ireland was referred. THIRD EDITION. Price 1s.

4. SUBSTANCE of Mr. CANNING's SPEECH in the House of Commons, Thursday, December 11, 1798, on Mr. TIERNEY's Motion respecting CONTINENTAL ALLIANCES. SEVENTH EDITION. Price 1s. 6d.

5. BRIEF EXAMINATION into the INCREASE of the REVENUE, COMMERCE, and MANUFACTURES, of GREAT BRITAIN, from 1792 to 1799. By GEORGE ROSE, Esq. THIRD EDITION, with Additions. Price 2s.

6. SUBSTANCE of a SPEECH made by LORD AUCKLAND in the House of Peers, on Tuesday, the 8th Day of January, 1799, on the third reading of the "Bill for granting certain Duties upon INCOME." FOURTH EDITION. Price 1s.

2

SPEECH

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

SYLVESTER DOUGLAS

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, APRIL THE 23D, 1799,

ON SECONDING THE MOTION OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, FOR THE HOUSE TO AGREE WITH THE LORDS IN AN ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY

RELATIVE TO

A UNION WITH IRELAND.

'There hath been put in practice in governments, these two several kinds of 'policy in uniting and conjoining of states and kingdoms; the one, to retain 'the ancient form still severed, and only conjoined in sovereignty; the other, 'to superinduce a new form, agreeable and convenient to the entire estate. 'The former of these hath been more usual, but the latter is more happy.'

LORD BACON.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. WRIGHT, PICCADILLY.

1799.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

1. SPEECH of the Right Hon. WILLIAM PITT, in the House of Commons, Thursday, January 31st, 1799, on offering to the House the Resolutions which he proposed as the Basis of an UNION between Great Britain and Ireland. SEVENTH EDITION. Price 1s. 6d.

2. SPEECH of the Right Hon. HENRY DUNDAS, in the House of Commons, Thursday, February 7th, 1799, on the subject of the LEGISLATIVE UNION with Ireland. THIRD EDITION. Price 1s.

3. SUBSTANCE of the SPEECH of the Right Hon. HENRY ADDINGTON, Speaker of the House of Commons, on the 12th February, 1799, in the Committee of the whole House, to whom his Majesty's most gracious Message of the 22d January, relative to an UNION between Great Britain and Ireland was referred. THIRD EDITION. Price 1s.

4. SUBSTANCE of Mr. CANNING's SPEECH in the House of Commons, Thursday, December 11, 1798, on Mr. TIERNEY's Motion respecting CONTINENTAL ALLIANCES. SEVENTH EDITION. Price 1s. 6d.

5. BRIEF EXAMINATION into the INCREASE of the REVENUE, COMMERCE, and MANUFACTURES, of GREAT BRITAIN, from 1792 to 1799. By GEORGE ROSE, Esq. THIRD EDITION, with Additions. Price 2s.

6. SUBSTANCE of a SPEECH made by LORD AUCKLAND in the House of Peers, on Tuesday, the 8th Day of January, 1799, on the third reading of the "Bill for granting certain Duties upon INCOME." FOURTH EDITION. Price 1s.

2

SPEECH

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

SYLVESTER DOUGLAS

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, APRIL THE 23D, 1799,

ON SECONDING THE MOTION OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, FOR THE HOUSE TO AGREE WITH THE LORDS IN AN ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY

RELATIVE TO

A UNION WITH IRELAND.

'There hath been put in practice in governments, these two several kinds of 'policy in uniting and conjoining of states and kingdoms; the one, to retain 'the ancient form still severed, and only conjoined in sovereignty; the other, 'to superinduce a new form, agreeable and convenient to the entire estate. 'The former of these hath been more usual, but the latter is more happy.'

LORD BACON.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. WRIGHT, PICCADILLY.

1799.

MUSEUM

SPEECH,

&c. &c.

MR. SPEAKER,

I TOOK occaſion, on a former day*, to expreſs my humble hope, that if a regular opportunity ſhould again occur, the Houſe would permit me to lay before them ſome thoughts on this great ſubject, which have appeared to me worthy of their attention; and to explain ſome of the grounds on which my opinion has been formed in favour of a Union with Ireland.

Nobody to whom I am known, will, I am perſuaded, impute to me the preſumptuous folly of imagining that I have it in my power to improve on what thoſe men of tranſcendent talents and eminent political wiſdom and experience, who have taken the principal ſhare in the former debates, have advanced on the leading points of this queſtion. But it is a queſtion of ſuch extent, that it may fairly be thought that even yet ſeveral important topics remain for conſideration, and ſome new views of thoſe which have been already diſcuſſed. It has been for a conſiderable length of time before the public in both

* On Thurſday, February 14, after reporting the reſolutions.

kingdoms: it has given riſe to various arguments in both Houſes of this and the other Parliament: and, upon every freſh occaſion, additional lights have been thrown upon it, and new difficulties and objections have been raiſed, by the fertility and eagerneſs of conteſt and oppoſition.

Some of thoſe objections may have ſeemed plauſible or ingenious; ſcarcely any, I think, have been weighty or ſubſtantial; none, I am ſure, of ſufficient weight to counterbalance the numerous benefits which there is ſuch reaſon to expect from the adoption of the meaſure. But they have been frequently ſuited to meet thoſe paſſions and prejudices, which naturally exiſt, or have been artfully excited, in our ſiſter kingdom; and, if we feel it our duty to recommend the propoſed incorporation to our fellow-ſubjects there, we owe it to them and to ourſelves to ſpare no pains in the endeavour to remove, by diſpaſſionate reaſoning and cool deliberation, ſuch obſtacles as may have appeared to them, or any number of them, to ſtand in the way of what moſt of us here, I believe, conſider as *material* for our intereſts and *eſſential* to theirs.

To thoſe who have attended to the various modes of reſiſtance to the propoſal of an Union, which have been reſorted to by different perſons, *two* circumſtances muſt have occurred as very remarkable.

One has been ſo well expreſſed in the reſolutions of the Grand Jury of the county of the city of Cork, that I ſhould do it injuſtice not to introduce the mention of it in the very language they have uſed: 'Whilſt we la-'ment,' ſay they, 'that any difference of opinion ſhould 'exiſt in this kingdom upon ſo important a queſtion, we 'cannot but remember how unanimous the rebellious and

'traitorous

'traitorous enemies of the country are in their reproba-
'tion of the meaſure*.'

The plan of the United Iriſhmen, with the aſſiſtance of the inveterate foe of the Britiſh empire and conſtitution, is to effect a ſeparation between Great Britain and Ireland. It is natural therefore that they ſhould dread nothing ſo much as any meaſure which *they* muſt look upon as fatal to that favourite object. That ſeparation is their favourite object we have many inconteſtable proofs; but it is ſufficient for me now to refer to the declaration of their founder, Tone, ſubjoined to the Report of the Secret Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords in 1797‖; and the deteſtation of a Union, which on that account the ſame claſs of men have always expreſſed, is equally notorious. The furious declamations of *M'Nevin*, *Lewins*, and others†, have been more than once referred to in this place‡; and within not many weeks from the preſent moment, ſome of thoſe ſelf-convicted traitors have contrived to publiſh to the world new libels on the government and conſtitution of their country§, their main view in which has manifeſtly been to co-operate, to this particular end, with thoſe who, though of a very different deſcription, and acting undoubtedly from motives of miſtaken patriotiſm, have exerted their talents and influence to counteract and retard what I am well perſuaded the good ſenſe of

* Vide the reſolutions of the Grand Jury of the county of the city of Cork, 26th March 1799.

‖ No. II.

† Proceedings of the meeting at Francis Street Chapel, 1795.

‡ Vide Speech of the Right Hon. *Henry Addington*, p. 21, &c. &c.

§ *Arthur O'Connor*'s Letter to *Lord Caſtlereagh*.—Demonſtration, &c. Aſcribed to *Dr. M'Nevin*.

that nation will not ſuffer them ultimately to defeat, that happy conſolidation of the empire which his Majeſty's paternal goodneſs has recommended to the conſideration of both his Parliaments.

The *other* circumſtance to which I have referred appears to me not leſs ſtriking. It is, that the oppoſers of Union have almoſt all endeavoured to convince us that the caſe of the incorporation of Scotland and England in 1707, is not in any degree applicable on the preſent occaſion.

I think there is conſiderable dexterity, though perhaps not a great deal of candour, in this attempt. In all great political operations, experience and hiſtorical precedent are the beſt and ſafeſt guides. Thoſe gentlemen have, therefore, juſtly thought they ſhould have a better chance of gaining their end, if they could induce us to ſhut our eyes againſt hiſtory, and wander with them in the obſcure mazes of theory and ſpeculation. Their ingenuity might then perhaps bewilder and perplex us; whereas, if we recur to that memorable event, its ſimilarity to what is now propoſed, both in principle and in all its moſt characteriſtic features, is ſo great, that they naturally feel it furniſhes, by its complete ſucceſs, after the trial of a century, the ſtrongeſt and muſt irreſiſtible refutation of their arguments.

In the firſt and preliminary point, for inſtance, of the queſtion of Union, that tranſaction is moſt eſpecially applicable, being the direct caſe of a national deciſion on the right and competency of Parliament.

I will

I will not enter at large into the general argument concerning the extraordinary powers of the ſupreme legiſlature of a country. It has been amply and ably treated in ſeveral of the prior ſtages of the preſent buſineſs, in this Houſe. If the Parliament, in our repreſentative government, is not competent to treat of, and conclude an incorporated Union, there is no authority which is; and, conſequently, a legitimate Union, in ſuch governments, never could take place.

The conſtituent body, or the electors, have no ſuch authority; they have not, by the practice or true theory of our conſtitution, any power of deliberation on any queſtion whatever; their only buſineſs as electors being that of ſelecting and nominating thoſe whom they think the fitteſt perſons to exerciſe that ſhare of legiſlation which is veſted in the third eſtate of Parliament: the act of the election is the beginning and end of their functions; the latent political rights of the people at large, whatever they may be, have not been delegated to *them*; and thoſe gentlemen, on the other ſide, who are the moſt ſtrenuous advocates againſt a Union, would, I ſhould think, be very unwilling to devolve that authority which is denied to the elected, on the elective body, as now conſtituted; ſince, in their opinion, they ought to be deprived of the very elective franchiſe itſelf, by what they call a *reform of Parliament*; the ſcheme of ſuch reform being, in many inſtances literally, and virtually in all, to deprive the preſent electors of that franchiſe.

But if the electors cannot deliberate and decide on ſuch a meaſure, much leſs can the people at large; who never, I believe, in the ſmalleſt ſtate, or moſt complete democracy,

mocracy, have exerciſed, in fact, by univerſal individual ſuffrage, deliberative, judicial, or legiſlative authority. Yet to maintain that the conſtitutional legiſlature of a country has not the right of doing certain acts, however clearly beneficial to that country, without a previous ſpecial commiſſion from the maſs of the nation, leads immediately to the falſe and miſchievous principle of the *direct ſovereignty of the people*, and to that equally miſchievous fiction to which it has given riſe, *viz.* That an *original compact* between the governors and governed is the only lawful foundation of government. Indeed, to reſort to the elementary parts of a nation, the numerical aggregate of individuals compoſing it, for authority to form a union, would be a complete admiſſion of ſuch ſovereignty; as the terms and conditions with which this numerical maſs might chooſe to accompany that delegation of power, would be an exemplification of ſuch original compact. But what ſort of philoſophy is that which traces the foundation of all political phenomena to a fact which no hiſtory ſhows ever to have exiſted, which the conſideration of the human character and the daily tranſactions, and paſt and preſent ſituations of life, demonſtrate to be, and always to have been impoſſible, and every attempt to realize which either by the *Jacquerie* in ancient France, the *Wat Tylers* and *Jack Straws* in England, or the modern Jacobins, has proved as pernicious and deſtructive*, as to ſuppoſe the poſſibility

* It has been unfortunate for the world, that ſo great and upright a man as Mr. *Locke* (led aſtray by the circumſtances of the times in which he lived, and the zeal of controverſy) ſhould have been the patron and advocate of this baneful, but, in his hands, too plauſible and ſpecious doctrine. *Locke's* fate has indeed been ſingular. He was a good ſubject and a pious Chriſtian.

ſibility of its actual exiſtence, is fooliſh and abſurd. The fatal conſequences of ſuch attempts to *reſtore*, as it is called, to the people the ſovereignty they are imagined to have farmed out, as it were, to their rulers, ſubject to divers claims of forfeiture and re-entry, has indeed been too well illuſtrated by the late eventful hiſtory of a neighbouring kingdom, for us here, or our fellow-ſubjects in Ireland, to require much argu-

tian. Yet, as his theory of government has ſerved for a baſis to the deſtructive ſyſtems of the *Condorcets*, *Prieſtleys*, and *Paynes*, ſo his metaphyſical principles have become the groundwork of the vain wiſdom and falſe philoſophy which began by denying the exiſtence of the material world, and proceeded, in the writings of the late Mr. *Hume* and others, to extend that wild ſcepticiſm of an ingenious and well-intentioned Prelate* to the diſbelief of ſpirit alſo, of the immortal nature of man, and the being of God himſelf. This remark has been, in a great meaſure, occaſioned by my recollection of a truly great philoſopher, to whoſe early leſſons and kindneſs I look back with tenderneſs and pride, who was among the firſt to prove that the ſyſtem adopted by *Locke* concerning ideas, tended, by its natural conſequence, to thoſe of *Berkeley* and *Hume*; but who, in announcing that opinion to the world, anxiouſly diſclaimed every wiſh or intention to diſparage the talents of thoſe, the fallacy and danger of whoſe doctrines he thought he could demonſtrate, and every view of arrogating to himſelf any peculiar ſagacity and diſcernment on that account. Indeed thoſe who remember him, know that there never was learning and wiſdom more free from arrogance and preſumption than his. 'A traveller,' ſays he, 'of good judg-'ment may miſtake his way, and be led unawares into a wrong 'track; and while the road is fair before him, may go on with-'out ſuſpicion, and be followed by others; but when it ends in 'a precipice, it requires no peculiar degree of wiſdom and pene-'tration to know he has gone wrong, nor perhaps to find out 'what miſled him†.'

* Biſhop *Berkeley*.

† Dr. *Reid*'s Enquiry into the Human Mind, p. 23.

ment

ment to convince us of its folly and wickedneſs. It has in that country overturned the throne of the Monarch and the altars of God; it has ſanctioned murder, parricide, and regicide; and has taught every illiterate peaſant to conſider himſelf as a fit candidate for ſupreme power, the ſovereign of his ſovereign, and the lawgiver of mankind—

Ergo, regibus occiſis, ſubverſa jacebat
Priſtina majeſtas ſoliorum et ſceptra ſuperba,
Res itaque ad ſummam fæcem turbaſque redibat *.

I agree with a perſon juſtly eminent, and for whom I entertain a very ſincere reſpect, when he ſays, 'that it 'is dangerous in a popular aſſembly to ſtate that there are 'points where the powers of the legiſlature end, and thoſe 'of the people at large begin †.' Indeed I know of no point where a legitimate conſtitutional power in the people at large begins; there may be ſome very ſpecial caſes to which that of the legiſlature cannot reach; and in which, according to my conception, when any meaſure becomes neceſſary and unavoidable, not the power, i. e. any *rightful* power of the people, but the diſſolution of the conſtitution and government, will begin; from which anarchy it muſt be left, in ſuch caſes, to chance, to the circumſtances of the times, and to the prudence and virtue of individuals poſſeſſing influence, either perſonal or from ſituation, to extricate the nation. It is indeed deli-

* Lucret. lib. v. ver. 1135.

† Vide the Speech of the Right Hon. *John Foſter*, p. 108. I had not then received the correct edition, but I had ſeen ſeveral accounts of it in different newſpapers. I ſhall take the liberty now to refer to it according to that correct edition in ſome of the following pages.

cate

cate and dangerous wantonly to moot ſuch ſort of caſes: no judge of human nature who is a friend to his country, ever will; whatever may be his particular creed and party on matters fairly debateable, and open to a ſafe difference in opinion.

There are however caſes of another deſcription, which may be more freely diſcuſſed, to which alſo the ſupreme power of the Legiſlature (in our conſtitution, of the Parliament) cannot extend; but which, being of a negative kind, and not requiring any meaſure to be taken or act done, do not connect themſelves with the notion of any neceſſary diſſolution of the frame of the government. They are, in truth, of ſuch a ſort, that, on their correct analyſis, it will be found, that the idea of the application of that power involves either phyſical or moral impoſſibility, or a natural contradiction in the terms of the propoſition.

Two examples, material for the preſent purpoſe, eſpecially the laſt of them, will illuſtrate the diſtinction to which I have wiſhed to draw the attention of the Houſe.

1ſt. Parliament cannot paſs a law which a ſubſequent Parliament ſhall not be able to repeal. The plain reaſon of this is, that the ſuppoſition of ſuch a power is contradictory to itſelf. It is to ſuppoſe the Parliament of next year leſs abſolute and ſupreme than the Parliament of this *.

2d. I have heard it contended, not without plauſibility, that the Parliament cannot diſmember the kingdom or

* *Coke's* Inſt. part iv. p. 42, 43.

circumſcribe the ſphere of its own authority, and conſequently that on that account, it cannot, diſſolve any union which by treaty or otherwiſe has blended into one ſtate, ſubject to its authority, parts which exiſted, previous to ſuch treaty, in a ſeparate and diſtinct condition, with ſeparate legiſlatures; that to ſuppoſe it capable of doing this is alſo a contradiction in terms; that the nation and its Parliament are each indiviſible integral parts, the one governed, the other governing, and forming together one indiviſible aggregate or body politic; that if you detach any part of this body, what remains is no longer the ſame ſtate, the ſame nation, the ſame legiſlature or parliament; that the two parts may form themſelves again each or either into a ſimilar conſtitution to what before exiſted, or into other conſtitutions; but that the diſmemberment will have effected that ſort of reſolution of the aggregate into its elements, which is known to happen in our municipal law, when, by the loſs of an integral part, an ordinary corporation is diſſolved, and loſes its corporate exiſtence; that it is univerſally true, that the diſmemberment of any legitimate ſtate cannot be a legitimate act of that ſtate; but neceſſarily ſuppoſes, even on ceſſions in virtue of conqueſt, exchange, &c. a diſruption of the integrity of the ſtate; that it might be difficult to argue this poſition on the hiſtory of thoſe ill-conſtructed conſtitutions where diſmemberment has in fact often taken place, or with regard to extreme caſes, of the ceſſion of ſmall inſignificant portions of a large dominion; but that nobody will ſay that the actual ſtate and conſtitution of Great Britain would remain if the county of Northumberland or Cornwall, the ancient kingdom of Scotland, or the principality of Wales, were detached from it.

But,

But, in the caſe of a union and incorporation of new parts, the incompetency of Parliament to decompoſe them is, I think, abundantly obvious, without adopting the foregoing opinion to its full extent, which I by no means do, with regard to the diſmemberment of ſome original fraction, or diſtrict, of what had always conſtituted one and the ſame ſtate. The eſſential condition of ſuch a union is the combination of each of the conſtituent parts into a new whole, in which the identical characters and qualities of thoſe parts are ſo loſt as that they can no where afterwards be found or reſtored. The contracting parties ceaſe to exiſt, and become incapable of being revived. It is as impoſſible to replace them *in ſtatu quo*, as it would be to recover the identical parts of two images of the ſame metal, which may have been melted together, and caſt into one new figure made up of both. Phyſically, or even morally and politically ſpeaking, Scotland, as a country, might be again disjoined from England: it might again have Parliaments, as England might have; but this muſt be by a proceſs exactly the ſame with that which ſhould ſeparate Cornwall, Norfolk, Caithneſs, or Sutherland, from Great Britain. It would not be a redintegration or reſtoration of Scotland to her former ſtate, as ſhe exiſted before 1707: that ſtate has been melted down and indiſſolubly mingled with that of England, which, in like manner, can never become a ſeparate kingdom, as of its ancient right.

If this reaſoning is as juſt and correct as it appears to me, all apprehenſions and alarms muſt neceſſarily vaniſh (alarms ſometimes attempted to be raiſed when it has been thought they might aſſiſt a little dearth of argument), of Great Britain aſſuming a right to break

through, and ſet aſide, at her pleaſure, any incorporation of this kingdom and that of Ireland, which the wiſdom and patriotiſm of the two Parliaments may adopt. After a Union, Ireland may again be ſeparated from Great Britain, as England may be torn aſunder from Scotland, by domeſtic *faction* and civil war, or by foreign hoſtility; but they never can be disjoined by any regular act of the united Government and Legiſlature.

In ſhort, it appears to me that a common Parliament, ſuch as was formed on the Scotch Union, and muſt be in contemplation now, muſt have the power of altering or repealing any of the former acts of either of the local Legiſlatures, i. e. either Engliſh or Scotch, Britiſh or Iriſh, a power daily exerciſed in regard to Engliſh and Scotch acts made previous to 1707; but that ſuch common Parliament cannot legitimately repeal or alter any of the fundamental and eſſential clauſes, articles, or conditions of that treaty, by which the Union ſhall be conſtituted; ſince the treaty authorized by each Legiſlature, concluded by commiſſioners, and then again ratified by each Legiſlature, when carried into effect, will render it impoſſible, upon any breach, for either party to reſume its former ſituation, and avail itſelf of the nullity thereby occaſioned, and of courſe impoſſible, conſiſtently with moral right and duty, for the united Parliament, i. e. beyond its legitimate powers, to commit ſuch a breach.

Before I proceed, the Houſe will permit me to explain what may otherwiſe be liable to miſrepreſentation or miſconſtruction. Though I have denied the ſtrict right of the conſtituent body to deliberate and decide on political queſtions, and either to limit or extend, by ſpecial commiſſion

miſſion and inſtructions, the powers veſted by law in their repreſentatives, yet I am very clearly of opinion, that the repreſentative does not perform his duty, or conſult the true intereſts of his country, who does not pay a due and reſpectful attention to the ſentiments, and even, in many caſes, to the inclinations and wiſhes of his particular conſtituents, and of the proprietors and inhabitants of the place he repreſents (with whom he commonly has the eaſieſt means of communication), as well as to the opinions which prevail in general among the different claſſes of his fellow-ſubjects. It is very true that there neither exiſts, nor can exiſt, any legal or formal method of collecting the individual opinions and ſuffrages of a whole nation; ſtill, however, the predominant ſentiment will force its way to the obſervation and underſtanding of the legiſlators, and will be in many, perhaps in moſt caſes, the beſt and moſt prudent guide for them to follow. If they neglect it, the period of re-election enables the voters (the majority of whom, even as now conſtituted in this kingdom, taking the whole country over, will, I believe, always be found to accord with the majority of the nation itſelf) to ſelect others who think more as they do on thoſe ſubjects of public concern which they have neareſt their hearts.

After all, ſome may think I might have ſpared the Houſe and myſelf the trouble of the foregoing diſcuſſion, as few, very few, within theſe walls have gone ſo far as directly to maintain the general incompetence of Parliament to ſuch a meaſure as a Union. But ſeveral, by expreſſions of doubt and ſurmiſe, by ambiguous words, ſcattered abroad at the riſk of miſleading the vulgar, the ill-informed, or ill-diſpoſed, among his Majeſty's ſubjects in Ireland, have ſet out with involving their opinion on this material

material point in oracular obſcurity, and have then gone on to aſſert, that whatever may have been the right of the Engliſh or of the Scotch Parliament in 1707, a Union between Great Britain and Ireland, or, at leaſt, ſuch a Union as is ſuppoſed to be intended, cannot be lawfully agreed to or carried into effect by either of the Parliaments of thoſe reſpective kingdoms. They aſſume, as the caſe I think muſt be, that in the minds of thoſe who have propoſed, or are friends to the meaſure, the proportion of members to be ſent by Ireland to the united Parliament is meant to be conſiderably leſs than the number of Britiſh members; which, if the example of the Scotch Union ſhall be followed in this particular, will remain as at preſent. 'This,' it is ſaid, 'would, in effect, amount 'to a total *ſurrender* of the legiſlative authority of Ire-'land to Great Britain. But the conſtituents of the 'Iriſh Parliament delegated to their repreſentatives the 'powers with which they inveſted them, for the purpoſe 'of exerciſing, not of ſurrendering, thoſe powers, for the 'purpoſe of maintaining a ſupreme, independent, and 'excluſive Legiſlature for Ireland, not to enable them to 'betray and deſtroy the independency, or rather the 'exiſtence, of the Iriſh Legiſlature. This,' it is al-leged, 'muſt be the caſe, if the members for Ireland are 'in a great diſproportion to thoſe for Great Britain. 'Though the Britiſh Parliament, therefore, ſhould be 'ſuppoſed competent to *receive*, in acceſſion to its legiſ-'lative authority over Great Britain, the like power over 'Ireland, the Iriſh Parliament can have no right to '*beſtow* that power, and ſubject their country, in that 'manner, to the government of a foreign Legiſlature. 'The addition of one ſixth, one fifth, or one fourth, to 'the preſent aggregate number of Britiſh members will 'leave the Britiſh Parliament as excluſively ſupreme over

'Great

'Great Britain as before, and will, at the ſame time,
'communicate to Great Britain as entire a ſupremacy
'over Ireland as ſhe formerly claimed (before the epoch
'of 1782) when that country was totally unrepreſented
'in Great Britain.'

In ſtating this ſort of argument, which I have endeavoured not to weaken or miſrepreſent, the caſe of Scotland ſeemed to militate ſo ſtrongly both againſt the *concluſion* of incompetency, and the aſſumed *fact* from which that concluſion is drawn, namely, the exerciſe of excluſive power by the greater over the leſſer country, that every effort of ingenuity has been uſed, though unſucceſsfully, to find out ſome intelligible ground of diſtinction between that tranſaction and the meaſure now in agitation.

1ſt. With regard to *the fact*. It is a matter of ſuch acknowledged notoriety, that in queſtions of a local nature, or which nearly concern the northern diviſion of this united kingdom, the members returned by Scotland have generally influenced the opinion and vote of the whole Houſe of Commons, that the Gentlemen on the other ſide have not been able to deny it. They have, therefore, been obliged to content themſelves with the hope that this, like other circumſtances relative to the Scotch Union, may be aſcribed to ſomething of a myſterious and undefinable nature, peculiar to the character and ſituation of that people; and they inſiſt, that whatever may have in practice counteracted the natural conſequence of the ſuperiority of numbers in that caſe, it is not leſs certain that the whole legiſlative authority over Scotland is veſted in the Engliſh members, than that 513 is a larger number than 45.

2d.

2d. As to *the conclusion*, they argue, that if the surrender (as they insist on terming it) which was made by the Scotch Parliament has not vitiated the whole transaction, it is either because the lapse of time and long acquiescence on the part of that country have, by a sort of prescription, confirmed the authority of the Parliament now denominated British, but still, in effect, only English, over Scotland; or because the Scotch Parliament was expressly empowered and commissioned by the constituents in that kingdom to agree to a Union.

In answer to these refinements it may be observed,

1st. That it is a new sort of prescription which can confirm or render valid, what, in its commencement, was a mere nullity; especially where the acts by which this nullity has been turned into a right, must, if the argument is well founded, have been throughout equally null and void. If the Scotch Parliament could not, in 1707, legally ratify the Treaty of Union, the act by which they purported to do so was void, and the royal assent, which was given to that act, having nothing on which it could operate, was void also; as much so as it would have been if given to an act by which the Parliament had attempted to legislate for France or Italy. But the ratification of the treaty by the Scotch Parliament was the essential condition on which that of England ratified it. If, therefore, the act of the Scotch Parliament was a nullity, so also must have been that which was only passed on the faith of its supposed validity. The one was the consideration for the other; and if England could receive nothing, neither could she mean to give, nor could give any thing; and the whole business resembled, on her part, what the lawyers call a *nudum pactum*.

Thus

Thus this doctrine neceſſarily leads to the inference, that the preſent Legiſlature of this country has no legitimate authority; that the powers it exerciſes are mere uſurpation; and that no man, either in Scotland or England, is bound to ſubmit to any of the laws which have been enacted for near a century.

2d. When, perceiving that this argument of acquieſcence fails by leading to ſuch a dangerous abſurdity, Gentlemen reſort to ſome ſuppoſed ſpecial delegation from the people or conſtituent body to the Parliament of Scotland, it will be recollected, as I have already ſhown, that the electors *could not*, by the conſtitution—in this reſpect the ſame in that kingdom as in England—make any ſuch delegation, ſo as to give it any force or validity; nor grant to the elected any peculiar powers, not incident to the mere character of repreſentatives duly choſen. I will now prove, that in 1707 no ſuch delegation *was in fact* attempted in Scotland.

There is undoubtedly a paſſage or two in *De Foe*'s Hiſtory of the Union, which ſeem to indicate ſomething ſpecial in the appointment of the members of the Parliament of Scotland, which concluded that Treaty*; and a ſuppoſed ſpecific authority, in that inſtance, though very little taken notice of in this Houſe, has been much relied on in ſeveral ſpeeches, and in various pamphlets, in the ſiſter kingdom. This circumſtance induced me to beſtow ſome pains in the inveſtigation of the matter, the reſult of which has been, as I was well perſuaded it would be, what I have juſt aſſerted, that no ſuch authority was in contemplation,

* *Stockdale*'s Edit. p. 230. 289.

much leſs required or conferred, at the time of electing that Parliament.

Indeed it would have been very extraordinary if the caſe had turned out otherwiſe, no hiſtorian of that period, or who has written ſince, having ever mentioned or alluded to ſuch a fact, if we except thoſe ſhort and obſcure paſſages in *De Foe* to which I have referred.

Nay, farther, in the ſeveral treaties preceding that which ſo happily accompliſhed the object, from the acceſſion of James the Sixth of Scotland to the crown of England downwards, no idea of the neceſſity, expediency, or, I may ſay, conſtitutionally ſpeaking, of the poſſibility of ſuch a reference to and delegation from the freeholders and burgeſſes, — forming themſelves, as they muſt have done, into what, in the modern French vocabulary, would be called *primary aſſemblies*,—ever ſeems to have been entertained by any projector, politician, lawyer, member of parliament, miniſter, or ſovereign whatever.

I will now, Sir, ſhortly ſtate what really happened in Scotland on the occaſion of the laſt and ſucceſsful treaty.

The Convention Parliament, or Eſtates, which had been aſſembled in that country on the abdication, or forfeiture, of James, and had met early in 1689, continued undiſſolved through all the reign of King William, and were ſummoned to meet by Queen Anne on the 9th of June 1702, a few months after her acceſſion. The anomalous formation of thoſe Eſtates is well known; and it will not be pretended, that any meaſure of Union between the two kingdoms was, at the time of their nomination,

mination, either agitated by the repreſented, or given in charge to their repreſentatives.

The ſixth Engliſh Parliament of King William, which had been called by the uſual proceſs (no ſpecial authority being pretended as to England), was ſitting on Queen Anne's acceſſion; and on the 6th of May 1702 * had paſſed an act, enabling the Queen to appoint commiſſioners for treating of an Union between England and Scotland.

As ſoon as the Scotch Parliament met after King William's death, this circumſtance was communicated to them in a letter from the Queen, and a ſimilar meaſure, on their part, recommended; and, in conſequence thereof, a like act was paſſed on the 23d of June 1702 †.

Commiſſioners were accordingly appointed on the part of each kingdom, and met at Weſtminſter on the 27th of October 1702.

In the mean time the Scotch Parliament, or Convention, was prorogued (30th June), and ſoon afterwards diſſolved, as was the Engliſh Parliament on the 2d of July 1702. But the commiſſions were not to determine by this diſſolution of the reſpective Parliaments, but to continue in force; and ſuch treaty as the commiſſioners might conclude was to be ratified by the ſubſequent Parliaments of each kingdom.

From the above deduction it is clear, that if thoſe commiſſioners had in fact proceeded to the concluſion of a treaty, no ſurmiſe could ever have been made, that

* 1 Anne, cap. 14.

† Scotch Acts 1ſt Parliament of Q. Anne, c. 7. p. 686.

on the part of Scotland any ſpecial mandate had ſerved as a foundation for the powers exerciſed on the occaſion.

A new Parliament was ſoon afterwards called, in the uſual way, in England, and met on the 20th of October 1702, a week previous to the meeting of the commiſſioners.

On the 8th of September a royal proclamation was publiſhed in Scotland, containing the following words:

'Whereas the late Parliament of that our ancient 'kingdom of Scotland is by our authority diſſolved, and 'conſidering that we are engaged at preſent in *a moſt 'juſt and neceſſary war*; and that by acts paſſed both in 'the Parliament of England and Scotland we are em-'powered, and have accordingly nominated *commiſſion-'ers to treat of an Union* betwixt theſe our kingdoms, 'and of other things, matters, and cauſes relating 'thereto, conform to the tenours of the ſaid acts, the 'concluſion of which Union to be eſtabliſhed and ratified 'in both Parliaments, will undoubtedly conduce to the 'laſting peace and welfare of both kingdoms; for which 'cauſes, and that we judge it neceſſary there ſhould be 'a Parliament in being to meet on ſuch occaſions as 'may require it, we have thought fit to call a Parlia-'ment of that our kingdom, to meet at our city of 'Edinburgh on the 12th of November next.'

This paſſage, in an inſtrument of which, after a good deal of reſearch, I have been furniſhed with a copy by the obliging attention of the gentleman who has the care of the public records at Edinburgh, is the only circumſtance and ſource to which I can trace the ſuppoſition of the alleged ſpecial authority of which I have been

been ſpeaking. I think it is no injuſtice to the Gentlemen who have pleaded that ſpecial authority, to ſuppoſe they had conceived it to reſt upon ſome more ſolid and tenable ground. Indeed I have not met with any evidence that they, or any writer or compiler, on the preſent occaſion, had taken the pains I have been prompted to do (in order to ſift every point of this great queſtion as thoroughly as I could), with regard to the proceeding which may have given riſe to the paſſages I have referred to in *De Foe*. But it is no wonder the ſort of argument there ſtated is ſo looſely, generally, and ſhortly expreſſed, and that ſo little attention ſeems to have been paid to it at the time, or by that very hiſtorian — the only one, as I before obſerved, who has ever hinted at it. Was the mention made of the war, in the ſame proclamation, a ſpecial or neceſſary notice to the electors of Scotland to inſtruct their repreſentatives how they were to act in the enſuing Parliament, as to granting or refuſing ſupplies? If it had been all at once diſcovered, that all former Parliaments which had entertained the queſtion of Union had exceeded the power and authority incident to their conſtitution, would there not have been ſome more ſolemn and ſpecific recital to that effect in the proclamation itſelf? Would that ſubject have been lumped, as it were, with ſo common and uſual a cauſe for holding a Parliament as the circumſtance of a war? Would not the proclamation have proceeded to give new and peculiar directions for the method of communicating to the electors the notice that they were to exerciſe a novel and extraordinary ſort of deliberation, and to communicate a new power to the elected, not neceſſarily veſted in them by the act of election and conſequent commiſſion, appointing them members of the Legiſlature? Would not the proceedings at the ſubſequent elections,

the

the ſummons, the returns, or, as they were called, and were in fact in Scotland, the commiſſions of the perſons choſen, have contained ſome reference to the ſubject? Would not the minutes of the election meetings, whether of counties or burghs, which in that country are drawn up with ſo much form and preciſion, have recorded the eſpecial object and purpoſe for calling the Parliament, and the inſtructions on that account given by each body of conſtituents? Would there have been no trace of any thing of that ſort among the entries in the corporation books of Edinburgh, or of the other cities, towns, and boroughs of the kingdom? Would there not have been ſome tradition, ſome memorial, ſome narrative, or ſome hint of a formal, or at leaſt of ſome incidental alluſion to the ſubject of Union at ſome of the elections? Of ſome conteſt founded on the known or declared opinions of different candidates, for or againſt the meaſure? And, laſtly, would not the very act of the Scotch Parliament, which ratified the treaty, have recited the ſpecial power which alone warranted them in that act, and which their general character as a Parliament did not authorize?

Now, Sir, not one of thoſe circumſtances exiſts. The proclamation, the copy of which I hold in my hand, gives no particular direction as to the elections. The ſummonſes for election, the commiſſions, the minutes, the corporation books, bear no marks or ſigns of any thing ſpecial. Hiſtory, memoirs, tradition, are all ſilent; and you know, Sir, that the act of the Scotch Parliament is equally ſo.

It is hardly neceſſary to wind up the narrative I have been giving, by ſtating that the commiſſioners who met by virtue of the two acts of 1702, and of whom thoſe

for

for Scotland muſt have been the only perſons in the contemplation of the electors of the new Scotch Parliament, if thoſe electors had exerciſed any judgment, as ſuch, on the ſubject of the propoſed Union, never came to any concluſive treaty or agreement. Their meetings were finally adjourned on the 3d of February 1703.

The new Scotch Parliament did not meet till the 6th of May 1703. On the 9th of September 1703 they voted, that *the commiſſion of Parliament*, as they called it, was terminate and extinct; and that there ſhould be no new one without the conſent of Parliament.

In February 1704-5 the Engliſh Parliament paſſed a new act, empowering the Queen to appoint commiſſioners, when a ſimilar act ſhould have paſſed the Parliament of Scotland*. On the 5th of April 1705, that firſt Engliſh Parliament of Queen Anne was diſſolved, and the new one met on the 27th of October.

In the mean time, after a great deal of angry proceedings in the Parliament of Scotland, during their firſt and ſecond ſeſſion, in the third, which began on the 28th of June 1705, an act alſo paſſed, authorizing the Queen to appoint commiſſioners †.

Under theſe two acts new commiſſions iſſued; that for Scotland on the 27th of February 1705-6, and that for England on the 10th of April 1706. The commiſſioners met at Whitehall on the 16th of that month; on the 22d of July the articles were executed; on the 16th of January 1706-7, they were (with ſeveral alterations) ratified by an act of the Scotch Parliament; and on the 6th of

* 3 and 4 Anne, cap. 7.

† Scotch Acts 1ſt Parl. of Q. Anne, 3d ſeſſion, c. 4. p. 776.

March of the ſame year, by the Engliſh ſtatute of 5th Anne, cap. 8. and the Union took effect on the 1ſt of May 1707.

Sir, I did in a prior debate *, declining at that time the *argument*, which was in much better hands, advert to the *authority* of ſeveral eminent perſons in Ireland on this queſtion of the competency of their Parliament, and referred to a debate in the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, in which the Lord Chancellor, the two Chief Juſtices, and the Chief Baron had voted, and three of them ſpoken in ſupport of its competency. What I then ſaid has been miſunderſtood. I have been ſuppoſed not only to have aſſerted what I have juſt mentioned, and (which I alſo admit I did) that Mr. *Foſter* and Sir *John Parnell* had avoided giving their ſanction to the contrary doctrine, but to have added, with ſome triumph and exultation, that there had nobody been found to maintain it but *M'Nevin* and *Lewins*. Sir, that is not what I ſtated. I did perhaps diſcover the ſatisfaction I felt from the conſideration that the diſtinguiſhed characters I have mentioned had ſupported that ſide of the queſtion which I thought was neceſſarily connected both with the general principles of government and thoſe of the Britiſh Conſtitution; but I never ſaid or meant to ſay, that no opinion had been delivered of an oppoſite ſort, by any body in Ireland, except *M'Nevin* and *Lewins*. I merely obſerved, that the names of thoſe who, at the different county and other meetings which had then taken place, had come to reſolutions denying the competency, did not appear; and that I thought it right, in contraſt with the learned Noblemen to whom I had

* Monday, 11th February 1799.

referred,

referred, to mention two notorious perſons in that kingdom, who had in their own names and characters pronounced boldly, and without heſitation, their authoritative opinion to that effect. It was therefore unneceſſary to queſtion me whether I did not know in particular that three conſiderable lawyers, and Members of the Iriſh Parliament, had denied this competency; and whether I doubted of their legal learning and abilities? I dare ſay they have denied it. I have indeed read in a printed letter, to which the name of one of thoſe gentlemen is ſubſcribed, 'That the Parliament 'of Ireland, true to itſelf and honeſt to its country, will 'never aſſume a power extrinſic of its delegation *.' Similar ſentiments may have been delivered by the other two, and by others in the ſiſter Parliament; and as to the legal abilities and acquirements of thoſe gentlemen, far be it from me to expreſs or entertain any opinion to their diſparagement. One of them I have the pleaſure of knowing; and that government, to which I had the honour of belonging when in Ireland, though ſo corrupt and wicked according to ſome of the Honourable Gentlemen on the oppoſite ſide of this Houſe, had the advantage of receiving from him a moſt ſtrenuous and ſpirited ſupport. I do not recollect the other two. I believe they were not in Parliament in my time, but I underſtand they are alſo men of talents and eloquence. But, Sir, I am perſuaded thoſe gentlemen themſelves would not think it implied any diſreſpect to them, as members of the profeſſion to which I once had the honour to belong, if I were now to ſay, that the opinions of barriſters, however able or eminent, are not, in point of authority, to be put in the balance, on a great conſtitutional point, with thoſe of the heads of his Majeſty's ſupreme tribunals, the

* Mr. *Barrington*'s Letter to Mr. *Saurin*, dated 20th January 1799.

fathers and oracles of the law; eſpecially when thoſe great judicial ſtations are ſo filled as they at preſent are.

But, is it true, that, with a diſproportion of members, ſuch as it may be ſuppoſed will be ſettled between the two countries, Ireland would only *give*, and Great Britain only *acquire?* I ſpeak now of legiſlative authority. In my judgment, quite otherwiſe. There would be a reciprocal, and, having regard to the reſpective weight of each in the ſcale of empire, an equal communication of power. The Lords and Commons of Great Britain would indeed acquire a direct ſhare in the legiſlation of Ireland, but ſo would the Lords and Commons of Ireland in that of Great Britain. Mutually they would relinquiſh, or, if Gentlemen like a more exceptionable word better, would ſurrender, the excluſive juriſdiction over their reſpective countries; but each would obtain a ſhare, commenſurate with its relative importance in the united ſtate, of the ſupreme dominion over the whole; and, therefore, as to the diſtinction attempted on the queſtion of right, how can it be contended that the Britiſh Parliament may lawfully receive within its boſom, ſay 80, 100, or 120 ſtrangers, veſting them individually with the ſame authority as its original members individually poſſeſſed, if the Iriſh Parliament cannot, on the condition of participating, according to due proportion, in the government of Great Britain and the empire, lawfully admit the legiſlators of this iſland and of the empire to a ſhare, adjuſted by the ſame rule of proportion, in the local government of Ireland? The idea that inequality of numbers would vitiate the tranſaction on the ſide of the weakeſt country, leads to this (as was well remarked by a Right Honour-

able

able Gentleman, in one of the more early debates*), that there could never be a lawful Union, unleſs the numbers in the united legiſlature were made correctly and arithmetically equal on both ſides. If ſo, had England agreed to the unreaſonable demand, during the laſt century, on the part of Scotland †, of joining the two Parliaments according to their then exiſting numbers, or were Great Britain now to receive into her Houſe of Commons, all the 300 repreſentatives of Ireland, and to unite together the two Houſes of Peers as they now ſtand, the tranſaction would ſtill have no legal ſolidity; the Scotch Parliament formerly, and the Iriſh Parliament now, would ſtill have betrayed their truſts.

But this junction of the Parliaments, this identification or incorporation of the two Houſes of each, in analogy to the identity which already exiſts as to the third eſtate, is treated as a deſtruction, an extinction, an utter annihilation of the conſtitution of Ireland. The ſame terms were miſapplied in Scotland to the Union of that country with this; for, ingenious and inventive in arguments on moſt ſubjects as ſome of our opponents are, they will give me leave to ſay, that on many of the points of this queſtion, they appear to me mere plagiariſts, to a degree of ſervility, not only of the topics, but, in general, even of the very language and expreſſions which were then employed. Of this any man may convince himſelf by comparing the late debates here and elſewhere, with the Hiſtory of *De Foe*, and the Memoirs of *Lockhart*.

In the caſe of Scotland and England the miſapplication was not ſo great. In that caſe, the third branch of

* Mr. *D. Ryder*. † In 1670.

each Legiſlature, though for the time it centred in the ſame perſon, was ſo far from being inſeparably mixed, ſo as to form one indiviſible whole, that a law actually exiſted*, by which its ſeparation, at no diſtant period, into two diſtinct ſovereignties, was expreſsly eſtabliſhed.

It were to be wiſhed that Gentlemen would explain what that eſſential part of the conſtitution of Ireland is, which the incorporation of its Lords and Commons with ours will annihilate. It has always appeared to me that in two principles is comprehended the eſſence of ours and of the Iriſh conſtitution, which, with the exception of certain abuſes, real or imputed, of different ſorts, to be found in each kingdom, is one and the ſame. How often have I heard Gentlemen in the Iriſh Parliament boaſt that they enjoyed, how often read in the publiſhed harangues and eſſays of Iriſh politicians, their exultation in the poſſeſſion of the Britiſh conſtitution! I ſay, I have always conceived that the moſt eſſential principles of that conſtitution are two: 1. That it is compoſed of three independent eſtates or branches, forming checks each upon the other two. 2. That no law can paſs, affecting the life, the liberty or property of the ſubject, without the concurrence of a repreſentative body choſen from among the people, in a mode formed on the conſideration of property and franchiſe, and conſiſting of an adequate number of perſons; and of ſuch a mixed deſcription, as to bring to the legiſlative aſſemblies competent knowledge, both of general and local concerns, and a ſympathy of intereſt in regard to every thing that can affect their conſtituents and the nation at large.

* The Scotch act of Anne, called the Act of Security, 1ſt Parliament of Queen Anne, 2d ſeſ. c. 3. p. 723.

Now, Sir, if this deſcription is in any degree true, how can it be ſaid, that the combining into one ſupreme Imperial Council a juſt number of the repreſentatives of both nations for one Houſe, and of the Peers for the other, will be the annihilation of the conſtitution? The Legiſlature of the empire may, in my opinion, in one point of view, and that perhaps the moſt enlarged and the ſoundeſt, be conſidered as one great political machine; conſiſting of one and the ſame ſupreme head, both executive and legiſlative; to which are attached, or linked and knit, two ſeparate members, while each of thoſe two is ſubdivided again into two analogous parts: the one, the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, empowered to prepare for the Sovereign's deliberation, ſanction, or rejection, whatever may ſeem neceſſary for Great Britain, and for the empire at large: the other, the Lords and Commons of Ireland, poſſeſſing only, but excluſively—as far as ſuch excluſion is conſiſtent with the idea of an unity of empire, either on the preſent or any other poſſible frame of ſuch a machine—the ſame power as to the kingdom of Ireland. Let me aſk, whether this machine, conſidered theoretically at leaſt, would not be ſimplified, its ſtructure improved, and the two eſſential objects I have pointed out, better ſecured, by blending and incorporating, in a fit proportion, the two ſeparate members into one?

But,

But, Sir, after making the beſt ſtand they can on this quickſand of incompetency, the Gentlemen proceed to the real merits of the queſtion, and expreſsly deny that Ireland will reap any benefit from the meaſure; meaning, I ſuppoſe, alſo to deny, that it will prove beneficial to this country, or to the empire at large. I ſuppoſe they mean this, becauſe I cannot think that any man of good ſenſe, or who is a real friend to Ireland, can diſjoin her intereſts from thoſe of this kingdom, and of the other parts of the Britiſh dominions, or contend that any great arrangement is unadviſable and unjuſt, which ſhall tend to the general advantage of thoſe other branches of the empire, merely becauſe no particular advantage may accrue to Ireland, provided that country is not thereby expoſed to ſome detriment or danger.

Let us therefore examine a few of the moſt prominent circumſtances of advantage which may be reaſonably expected to flow from a Union, in the firſt place, *to Great Britain*, and to *the reſt of his Majeſty's dominions*; but, ſecondly, *to Ireland*;—conſidering the ſubject in a general view of legiſlative and executive government, of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture, of internal peace, civilization, and proſperity: under which heads we may alſo diſcuſs ſome of the principal objections which have been relied on, either here or in the ſiſter country.

With regard to *this country*, its legiſlative and executive councils would no longer be liable to be perplexed in conſequence of the diſtinct machinery of a ſeparate Iriſh

Iriſh Parliament, nor the general government continue in conſtant danger of miſapprehenſion and diſputes, and ſubject to the inconveniences which inevitably ariſe from circuity of communication, and the impediments and embarraſſing modifications to which jealouſy or ignorance on the one ſide or the other will ſo often give occaſion (while things remain as they are), in many of the moſt important concerns of the empire.

In other reſpects it may be difficult to foreſee any immediate advantage to Great Britain; to her manufactures, her agriculture, her trade, or general proſperity. Some people, indeed, rather apprehend danger to Britiſh commerce and manufactures; and that ſuppoſed migration of capital and ſkill to a cheaper country, to a country poſſeſſing a ſuperiority of ſituation as to many branches of buſineſs which has been often the ſubject of public diſcuſſion, is argued upon as a too probable conſequence of a Union *. To this it might be a ſufficient anſwer for the ſtateſman to ſay, that if what one part of the united kingdom ſhall loſe another will gain, there will be no public detriment to the whole. But that anſwer, I own, ſounds harſh to my ears. I think you ought not, on ſuch general conſiderations of policy, to overlook the feelings and intereſts of the numerous individuals and claſſes of men, who have, as it were, localized their ingenuity, their induſtry, their wealth, and their habits of life, under the countenance and implied faith of pre-exiſting laws and inſtitutions. There is a better anſwer, I believe, in the fact, that capital and induſtry ſo localized are not eaſily influenced at once to change their ſituation, by ſuch temptations. The attempts which have been made, at various times, to transfer, by ſome ſudden effort of ſpeculation and enterpriſe, Eng-

* Mr. *Peele*'s Speech.

liſh

liſh money and credit, and Engliſh art and ſkill, to cheaper and more eligible places in Scotland, Wales, and even Ireland, have rarely been ſucceſsful, or perſevered in; and it is no inconſiderable illuſtration and proof of this poſition, that, even with regard to external trade, which is certainly more locomotive than manufactures, thoſe towns and ports where accident at firſt, and a long ſeries of cauſes afterwards, have operated to eſtabliſh it, are ſeldom or ever out-rivalled, or their commerce drawn off, by any exertions however powerful in favour of ſituations better adapted by nature for carrying it on.

Gradually, however, after a Union, Ireland will undoubtedly attract much wealth, capital, and credit from this country, not only by the circumſtances of advantage to which I have alluded, but alſo, more eſpecially, becauſe an uniformity of laws and legiſlature will give greater confidence to thoſe who may be diſpoſed to embark in enterpriſes of ſpeculation, or place their money on commercial or landed ſecurities in that kingdom. This, one ſhould think, would be a ſtrong and reaſonable argument with Ireland (of which afterwards); but ſuch gradual benefit to be reaped by her, will not affect the intereſts of individuals now engaged in buſineſs here, and will unqueſtionably, from the known principles and hiſtory of public wealth, tend in its progreſs, by multiplying intercourſe, and the returns of profit in and between both countries, to increaſe the riches of both, and of the whole empire.

Let us now give a moment's conſideration to the effects of the propoſed Union on that *empire*, as an aggregate

gate of which, Great Britain and Ireland form the two chief and preponderating members.

And here, Sir, it will be enough juſt to obſerve, what no man, I think, can deny, that in all caſes where it is practicable, one general, ſuperintending, and controlling legiſlature, is the beſt fitted for the ſteady, conſiſtent, and rational government of all the parts of that combination of individuals and territories which conſtitutes what is denominated a ſtate.

To endeavour to enforce this poſition by a long train of argument, indiſputable as I conceive it to be, would be an unwarrantable waſte of time and words.

It has indeed been ſaid, in anſwer to thoſe who have pointed out the obvious inconvenience which might ariſe from a difference of opinion on any great imperial queſtion, as of peace and war, between two diſtinct Parliaments, that equal inconvenience would follow from a difference of a like ſort between the ſeveral branches of the ſame Parliament; but that ſuch differences, though they may be ſuggeſted by theory, have not been found to happen in practice*. I muſt beg leave to ſay that they certainly ſometimes have happened, both between the two Houſes, and between thoſe Houſes and the Sovereign, in the Britiſh Parliament, and with the hazard, at leaſt, of conſiderable detriment to the ſtate. But there are material diſtinctions between the two caſes which have been thus brought into compariſon. The identity of intereſt between the ſeveral branches of the legiſlative and executive government of the ſame country is much more direct and ſenſible, and therefore, on diſcuſſion, much leſs apt to be miſtaken by either, than what exiſts be-

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 54, 55.

tween two kingdoms, though forming parts of the ſame empire. Beſides, there is a facility of diſcuſſion and explanation, by conference, addreſs, remonſtrance, &c. between the reſpective branches of the ſame Parliament, which cannot take place between two diſtinct Legiſlatures.

It is alſo ſaid, that the checks which the proceedings of the three branches of the ſame Parliament produce, furniſh a principle to which our conſtitution owes its ſtability, and that ſimilar checks exiſt between the two ſiſter Parliaments*. No doubt this is true to a certain extent; but it would be eaſy to ſhow, that in the caſe of the two Parliaments ſuch checks exiſt in a very imperfect degree, without any foundation in their formal and legal conſtitutions†, and with little more force or efficacy, than thoſe which prevail in the relations of different ſtates, having common intereſts, but no link or connexion in their governments. Such checks between the different nations of our part of the globe contributed for a time to maintain what uſed to be called the balance of Europe; but although thoſe of a more ſubſtantial and operative kind, in concurrence with other cauſes, have to this day preſerved, and, I truſt, if perpetuity can belong to human inſtitutions, will ever preſerve our frame of government, the other and inferior ſort has not been found of equal power in giving permanency to that balance.

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 55.

† This is not inconſiſtent with what is afterwards ſaid of the juriſdiction the Britiſh Parliament may exerciſe over the executive miniſters who adviſe the King in aſſenting to, or rejecting Iriſh bills. That juriſdiction is without power to ſtop ſuch aſſent or rejection; and, therefore, forms no immediate or abſolute check, though it may afterwards puniſh thoſe who have adviſed the Crown to give or refuſe its aſſent.

I admit

I admit that circumſtances of diſtance (there may be others) are ſometimes ſuch as to render ſo deſirable an object as one common imperial legiſlature impracticable. Such I take to have been the caſe with regard to our colonies in North America. I believe all ſober men of all parties, both here and on that continent, would have agreed, that, could it have been done, the admiſſion into the Britiſh Parliament of an adequate number of repreſentatives from thence, would have been the happieſt method of reconciling the diſputes and removing the difficulties which terminated in a civil war, and the ſeparation of that country from the empire. Dr. *Adam Smith*, and many others, recommended the experiment. The immenſe diſtance, and the uncertainty of regular, periodical, frequent, and early communication between American repreſentatives in Great Britain and their conſtituents in America, ſeem to me to have oppoſed inſurmountable obſtacles to ſuch a plan.

But that no valid objection of a like nature exiſts in the caſe of Ireland, is, I think, abundantly manifeſt. Some gentlemen, indeed, of that country have expreſſed, in very ſtrong language, their ideas of the inconvenience which would attend what they quaintly term a *tranſmarine* Parliament; and one learned barriſter, at the celebrated meeting of the profeſſion which took place early in Dublin, is ſtated to have pronounced, 'That a Britiſh 'Miniſter ſhall not, and cannot, plant another Sicily in 'the boſom of the Atlantic, and that God and nature 'never intended that Ireland ſhould be a province *.'

If by this is meant, that the intervening channel is, in the nature of things, an inſuperable difficulty in the way

* Debates of the Iriſh Bar, 9th December 1798, p. 47.

of a legiſlative Union; I anſwer, that in principle (however widely the caſes differ in importance) the reaſon would equally apply to the iſlands of Orkney and Shetland, and would have applied, in former times, to the town of Calais. As to the idea, that Ireland, by a Union, will, in any degrading or offenſive ſenſe of the word, become a province, in any other ſenſe than that according to which ſhe and Great Britain are now provinces of the general empire; I deny it. Ireland, indeed, will no longer be a diſtinct kingdom; but neither will Great Britain: they will both become, as it were, *aliquot* parts of one incorporated realm, inſtead of remaining ſeparate *integral* parts of the empire.

It is true, that the interpoſition of the ſea forms a geographical ſeparation between them, which did not exiſt in the caſe of England and Scotland. But, on the other hand, Dublin is nearer to London than Edinburgh is; and the journey, notwithſtanding the ſea paſſage, is, I believe, in general, performed in a ſhorter time; Cork, Limeric, and Londonderry, the moſt diſtant conſiderable cities in Ireland, from the Britiſh metropolis, are nearer to it than ſeveral of the principal towns in the north of Scotland; and no part of Ireland is ſo far removed from this city as the counties of Sutherland and Caithneſs; not to mention again the Orkney and the Shetland Iſlands.

Beſides, it is to be obſerved, that Great Britain is the *only* neighbour of Ireland, and that while the eaſtern coaſt of Scotland is open to a near and eaſy intercourſe with other countries, Great Britain intercepts almoſt entirely all direct communication between Ireland and the continent of Europe, while the immenſe expanſe of the Atlantic divides that iſland from all other parts of the globe.

If

If we add to theſe conſiderations the many and important facilities, or rather invitations, to a more thorough incorporation of England and Ireland—and which now muſt comprehend Scotland—that did not exiſt in the former caſe; the ſame ſyſtem of laws, civil and commercial; the ſame rules of property; ſimilar tribunals; correſponding forms of legiſlature; a common origin; extenſive conſanguinity, and intermarriages; the great number of thoſe who, by ſucceſſion or acquiſition, are daily becoming owners of land in both kingdoms; the ſame eſtabliſhed religion; the ſame courſe of education, &c. &c.—If we conſider all theſe circumſtances, that of abſolute territorial contiguity ſeems to be infinitely outweighed, and, as it were, totally to vaniſh from our ſight.

Having incidentally cleared away, as I flatter myſelf I have, this objection of the want of immediate juxta-poſition, I ſhall not, for the preſent, revert to any farther examination of more general, or, as they are often called, imperial conſiderations; but will now proceed to take a view of ſome of the peculiar benefits which I think *Ireland* would derive from the propoſed arrangement.

At preſent, ſhe has no ſhare whatever in the legiſlation of Great Britain, nor, as I have always heard admitted, in that of the empire. Her Parliament can take no part in the regulations neceſſary for the government and adminiſtration of our foreign poſſeſſions in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies, in Aſia, Africa, or America, of thoſe in the Mediterranean, or even of thoſe in her own immediate neighbourhood, in St. George's Channel, or on the weſtern coaſt of France. Is any one ſo ignorant as

not

not to perceive how materially ſuch regulations may affect the commercial and political intereſts of Ireland?

On the admiſſion of her repreſentatives among thoſe of this iſland, ſhe will immediately acquire her proportionate ſhare in all thoſe great concerns; a voice in the legiſlative government of Great Britain, and of every part of the Britiſh dominions.

This is not all: Ireland will not only have this ſhare of general legiſlation, through the influence and ſuffrages of her own immediate repreſentatives; ſhe will alſo be repreſented and entitled to ſpeak through the influence and ſuffrages of every one of the 513 members choſen in this iſland. This was ably pointed out in a former debate, by a Gentleman who, on that occaſion, diſcovered the moſt enlarged and liberal views of general policy, united to the ſoundeſt ſpeculative as well as practical knowledge of commerce and manufactures *.

And here we may perceive the groſs fallacy of the idea which ſo often mixes itſelf in theſe debates, and has, as we have ſeen, been founded on in the argument of incompetency; viz. that the concerns of Ireland will be ſolely and excluſively attended to, and this too on a principle of oppoſition and hoſtility, by the ſmaller number of members which ſhe will have to chooſe. It will, on the contrary, be then the duty, and on all great points will, I am ſatisfied, be the deſire and the true intereſt of thoſe elected here, to give their due weight to the intereſts, general or local, of Ireland, in their deliberations and in their votes; and in caſes where they do not, I am apt to believe, what reſpects Ireland will be wholly left to the deciſion of the Iriſh members, as

* Mr. *Peele*.

I have

I have already obſerved to have happened ſo generally in regard to the Scotch members of the Britiſh Parliament, when the ſubject before the Legiſlature has merely related to Scotland. Natural and fair reaſons for this, and equally applicable to Ireland, might eaſily be ſtated; but it is enough here to appeal to the fact, which has been ſo notorious, that when my Right Honourable Friend aſked in a former debate, whether Scotland had, in conſequence of her comparatively ſmall number of forty-five members, been oppreſſed or taxed beyond her proportion ſince the Union? the mere ſuppoſition, ſo contrary to experience, forced a ſmile from the Gentlemen on the other ſide of the Houſe.

But, as I have juſt ſaid, *every* individual in the united Parliament, will in principle, and as a duty, have veſted in him a portion of Britiſh and alſo a portion of Iriſh repreſentation, and this, in the ratio of the comparative weight and importance of the two countries in the general ſcale. And do not let Gentlemen pay ſo poor a compliment to the candour and wiſdom of Britiſh Legiſlators as to think they will either ſupinely or partially ſhut out from their minds important objects which may more immediately concern Ireland, but the deciſion on which cannot but alſo affect the welfare of the whole united kingdom. Many, indeed, choſen for Great Britain will feel even perſonal motives as ſtrong or ſtronger for looking to the advantage of Ireland as for conſulting that of this country. Have we, for inſtance, any reaſon to ſuppoſe that the Honourable Member for Stafford, if he ſhould happily fail, as I truſt he will, in the object of his preſent miſtaken zeal, and the Union ſhould be eſtabliſhed, will be a leſs vigilant guardian of the privileges and intereſts of his native land, than of thoſe of

the

the country he has thought fit to adopt? or will a native of Great Britain, if he happens alſo to be a merchant principally engaged in Iriſh commerce, and looking to that country as the ſource of his wealth and fortune; will the opulent Engliſh mortgagee of an eſtate in Ireland (of which deſcription ſome, I believe, have now ſeats in this Houſe) will men of that ſort, members choſen for Britiſh ſeats, to the united Parliament, be apt to overlook that part of their duty which they will owe to the ſiſter iſland? Such Gentlemen are even now prompt enough, and I mention it to their honour, to ſpeak as if they already repreſented Ireland here. But, as matters ſtand, they can hardly do ſo conſtitutionally, and certainly not effectually. If a Union take place, ſuch a conduct will be at once reconcilable to their inclination, their rights, and their duty.

Sir, it has been a very common objection in Ireland to meaſures affecting that country undertaken by the government here, that miniſters in London, with all the opportunities their ſtations may furniſh, and their ſenſe of duty urge them to improve, have not the means of acquiring ſuch an habitual and detailed knowledge of the characters, circumſtances, and intereſts of that kingdom, as would have been neceſſary to enable them to have judged with ſufficient certainty of the juſtice or policy of ſuch meaſures. I do not mean here to refer to thoſe perſons in that kingdom who have borrowed from the phraſeology of their predeceſſors in Scotland the inflammatory and inapplicable terms of *foreign* government, *foreign* cabinet, *foreign* miniſters, &c. I ſpeak of many men firmly attached to the connexion with Britain and the intereſts of the empire, and who conſider Iriſhmen and Britons not as foreigners to each other,

but as friends and countrymen, living under the allegiance of the ſame ſovereign, and entitled reciprocally to all the privileges—I was going to ſay of *citizenſhip*, but that word has been profaned,—of natural born-ſubjects, in either kingdom. Men even of that deſcription are not unfrequently heard to ſay, 'The government in England 'is unacquainted with the concerns and the people of this 'country. They ſeldom interfere without doing harm. 'Why do they not leave us to ourſelves?'

It is needleſs to argue the obvious inadmiſſibility of the concluſion thus drawn from premiſes concerning the truth of which it is not my buſineſs to inquire. The adminiſtrators of the ſupreme ſuperintending government of the empire, in all its parts, muſt reſide near the perſon of the Sovereign. But though we cannot give way to the principle, it does not follow that the facts may not, in ſome inſtances, have proved more or leſs true.

Now, Sir, the incorporation of the legiſlatures would, I think, by the frequent preſence of the Iriſh Peers and Commoners at the ſeat of general government, afford a perfect cure to this evil. Men thoroughly acquainted with all the affairs of that kingdom; natives, probably, of all or moſt of the different cities and counties; perſons poſſeſſing property, engaged in trade and manufactures, or exerciſing profeſſions over the whole extent of the country, would be then, during the ſitting of Parliament, ready on the ſpot to repreſent to the Miniſters, or even ſubmit directly to the Sovereign, and when the occaſion called on them, in the different ſtages of any meaſure, or on the firſt preſſure of any emergency, would have it in their power to bring before the eyes of the imperial Legiſlature itſelf, and ſupport in both Houſes, by their weight, their talents, and

their ſuffrages, whatever their duty to their country, or to their immediate conſtituents, might ſeem to require.

But the moſt ſeducing topic with the vulgar, and with ſome alſo in Ireland of a higher claſs who poſſeſs a ſtronger ſenſe than underſtanding of national dignity and honour, has been the independence of their country. This is repreſented as ſo inſeparably connected with the Parliament they now enjoy, that when the mode of their legiſlation ſhall be changed, and they ſhall ceaſe to have this Parliament excluſively their own, they imagine the nation muſt ceaſe to be independent, and that they will become a debaſed and degraded people. Sir, when ſuch a change as is propoſed, is conſidered as a degradation and debaſement, it certainly muſt ariſe from ſome confuſion in the ideas annexed to thoſe words.

If Ireland and its Parliament ſhall be incorporated with the Britiſh nation and Parliament, they will undoubtedly loſe their diſtinctneſs and identity. They will no longer have a ſeparate political exiſtence; they will become, but ſo will Great Britain and her Parliament, parts only of the united whole; and in as far as a part cannot be ſaid to be independent of the other parts, Ireland will, in that ſenſe, become dependant on Great Britain, but ſo will Great Britain on Ireland. If after this it ſhall be contended that the leſſer part is more dependant than the greater, the argument will be found to reſolve itſelf into what we have already diſcuſſed, namely, the effects of the diſproportion of numbers between the Iriſh and Britiſh members of the common Parliament.

May I, however, be permitted to aſk whether the Iriſh Parliament, even ſince the boaſted revolution or conſtitution

conſtitution of 1782, is, or ever can, in its ſeparate, yet connected ſtate, be totally independent? I know, Sir, that this may be reckoned delicate ground, but it has been, unguardedly I think, reſorted to by the enemies of a Union, and I but follow them in entering upon it; and, beſides, I feel too ſtrongly the ties of duty and affection by which I hold myſelf to be connected with that country as well as this, to avoid any part of the argument, which has been rendered neceſſary to a ſound deciſion, merely becauſe, if ill underſtood, what I may ſay upon it may prove unpopular in the neighbouring kingdom. In ſuch circumſtances *maluerim veris offendere quam placere adulando.*

Is then a Parliament independent, whoſe proceedings cannot receive the force of law without the act of perſons not members of that Parliament in any of its branches, and who, in acting or refuſing to act in that reſpect, are themſelves reſponſible to another Parliament? Yet that this is the very condition and ſtate of the Iriſh Parliament is clear from the ſtatute-book of Ireland; and indeed its being ſo is fondly conſidered by ſome of the moſt able, though, alas! alſo moſt prejudiced oppoſers of a Union, as eſſential to the happy connexion of that country with this. 'The ſtatute (Iriſh St. 20 & 22 Geo. 'III. c. 47.) enacts, that no bill ſhall paſs into a law 'in Ireland, unleſs it be returned under the Great Seal 'of Great Britain; thus not leaving the connexion of 'the two kingdoms a bare junction under one ſove-'reign, but ſecuring the continuance of that connexion, 'by making the Britiſh miniſter anſwerable to the Bri-'tiſh nation' (i. e. the Britiſh Parliament), 'if any law 'ſhould receive the royal aſſent in Ireland which could

'in any way injure the empire, be incompatible with its 'imperial intereſts, or tend to ſeparate Ireland from it*.'

To analyſe this matter more in detail. The Great Seal of Great Britain cannot be put to an Iriſh bill but by the Chancellor or Lord Keeper of that ſeal, who will ſeldom execute this duty of his office without the concurrence of thoſe other Miniſters of State, members of the Britiſh Council, who conſtitute what is called the Cabinet. Every act ſo done, though under the command of the King, is an executive, not a legiſlative act, which the Miniſter adviſes and performs at his peril, liable to be called to account for it by impeachment in this Parliament. His Majeſty's perſonal expreſſion of his aſſent to an Iriſh ſtatute is perhaps as purely legiſlative as that by which he aſſents to a Britiſh law; but every public act done by a ſubject, except his ſpeaking and voting in Parliament, is in its nature executive, and that for which he is reſponſible. In the ſentence I juſt now took the liberty to repeat, there ſeems to be implied ſome notion or ſuggeſtion that the reſponſibility of the Britiſh Miniſters is confined to the caſe of Iriſh ſtatutes affecting the empire at large, or tending to a ſeparation of the two kingdoms. The Iriſh act referred to, ſays no ſuch thing. It is indeed very common to hear a diſtinction made between acts of the Iriſh Parliament concerning the local policy and intereſts of that kingdom, and thoſe whoſe objects are imperial. In a popular ſenſe, and in extreme caſes, ſuch a diſtinction no doubt exiſts. A road or eſtate bill in Ireland can hardly, by any poſſibility, concern the empire at large; and it might be folly in a Britiſh Chancellor or Cabinet to exerciſe any judgment, or apprehend any

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 24.

reſpon-

reſponſibility, in regard to it. But the law draws no line, and in every Iriſh ſtatute of any conſiderable moment the empire muſt be more or leſs concerned. Who is to judge of the degree in which it is ſo, or of the propriety and ſafety of adviſing his Majeſty to receive or reject any ſuch ſtatute? who but the Miniſter or Miniſters who may be queſtioned for giving that advice, and carrying it into effect? a queſtion which any member for any county or borough in this kingdom may ſtir whenever he pleaſes. I muſt therefore aſk again, whether this does not prove that there ſtill remains not a ſhadowy, but a real and ſubſtantial ſubordination or dependance of the Iriſh on the Britiſh Parliament; a dependance or ſubordination inherent in the very nature of the preſent mode of connexion between the two countries *.

* The following paſſage will be found entirely to agree with what is above ſtated: 'I do not heſitate to ſay, that in thus rendering the Great Seal of Britain neceſſary to the paſſing an Iriſh 'law, if we created a theoretic difference in the conſtitution of 'the two kingdoms, which renders ours *inferior*, it is one not 'injurious to us, but *neceſſary from our ſituation in the empire* †.' To ſome of the concluding part of the ſame paragraph I can by no means aſſent, *viz.* 'And one with which we are content, and '*which ſecures Union and connexion on a firm and laſting baſis.*' The perſon whoſe words theſe are, and moſt of the friends of Great Britain in Ireland, may be content with the inferiority he mentions, or at leaſt prefer it to the misfortune of ſeparation; but how it ſhould be thought that a mere act of the Iriſh Parliament, which may be repealed as it was enacted, can ſecure a laſting Union and connexion, eſpecially with our late experience of the alarming exertions of ſo many enemies of Great Britain, at home and abroad, to deſtroy that connexion, is really matter of ſurpriſe. Is the Iriſh act of 21 & 22 Geo. III. 'a *parchment roll*' of greater and more permanent force and virtue than a treaty of Union, ratified by both Legiſlatures, would be §?

† Mr. *Foſter's* Speech, p. 24.

§ Ibid. p. 51. 63.

With regard to the executive government, its ſubordination is ſtill more obvious. The King's ſolemn commands, to be executed in Ireland, are either communicated to the Lord Lieutenant when he enters upon his office by his commiſſion and general inſtructions under the ſeals of Great Britain, or by King's letters, tranſmitted from time to time, and counterſigned by one of the Secretaries of State, or, in revenue matters, by the Lord Treaſurer or three of the Lords of the Treaſury. This courſe of buſineſs, if I recollect rightly, is reported to have been ſtated nearly as I have taken the liberty of doing, by a diſtinguiſhed Peer of both kingdoms, in the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, about a year ago*.

What is the conſequence of all this? Ireland is ſtill jealous of her independency. We are told by many, that ſhe conquered that independency, and will maintain it by the ſword: ſhe therefore revolts at the practical exerciſe of powers conſtitutionally veſted in the Parliament and Miniſters of this country. The government here, partly from the fear of renewing former or exciting new animoſities, partly from other cauſes, are ſuppoſed in general caſes to leave matters to the Iriſh Parliament, and the Miniſters of that country. From time to time, however, points will occur where there may appear ſtrong and cogent reaſons for their exerciſing their own judgment and diſcretion, and this perhaps in a manner contrary to the ſentiments prevailing with the ſervants of the Crown in Ireland. In ſuch caſes the difficulty may often be ſurmounted by the prudence of confidential intercourſe, and the adoption of ſome middle way, ſuggeſted by good

* The Earl of *Moira*. Report of the Debate on his Lordſhip's motion, 19th February 1798, p. 46.

temper

temper and good ſenſe on the one ſide and the other, ſo as not to alarm the dignity of Ireland, or commit the imperial authority reſident here. But more than once, even ſince I have had my attention directed to Iriſh affairs, ſituations have ariſen in which the Engliſh Miniſtry have thought it their duty (whether they were right or wrong on thoſe particular occaſions, is not now the point) to exerciſe, without ſuch a temperature, an immediate controlling authority in Ireland. Now, Sir, whenever this has happened they have incurred more than the hazard of rouſing the jealouſy, and affronting the high ſpirit of ſome of thoſe perſons in that kingdom who had been accuſtomed to a leading ſhare in the meaſures of her government, and may think they are conſcious to themſelves of a ſuperior knowledge of her affairs.

Here then is a dilemma which has already occaſioned many difficulties, and which, unleſs ſome remedy can be applied, and ſome alteration take place, will, I fear, in future, be the ſource of growing embarraſſment to both governments, and much ill blood between the two countries; nor can I ſee the poſſibility of any alteration which can have the effect of a remedy whilſt the preſent ſyſtem remains. His Majeſty, in order to exerciſe his legiſlative and executive functions, muſt either go to Ireland; or he muſt exerciſe them through the medium of ſervants, reſponſible and impeachable here; or Ireland, by its repreſentatives, muſt come to England. The firſt of theſe plans would only remove the difficulty as to Ireland by throwing it upon Great Britain; and beſides, the reſidence ofthe K ing of the Britiſh dominions any where but in Great Britain will hardly be propoſed. The ſecond we have ſhown to be incompatible with the real independency of Iriſh legiſlative and executive government,

ment. The third, therefore, only remains; i. e. such a legislative Union and incorporation, as that the Irish nation shall be represented in this country by an adequate number of Lords and Commoners, returned to serve at Westminster in a common or united Parliament. Then, indeed, it will be no longer true of Ireland, that she 'must 'tamely follow Great Britain with submission and sub-'serviency;' then she will be no longer *gens quæ juxta jacet, dubiæ libertatis*; the country and its legislation will then, by their identification with this, be truly independent. They never can be so otherwise, unless Ireland will separate herself from Great Britain, and can trust to her own strength and means in resisting, or to the liberality of our enemies in not attempting to impose upon her the yoke of a government really foreign.

HAVING said so much on the topics of general policy, in respect to legislation and executive government, I will now, with the leave of the House, examine this question of Union, as it may affect the interests of Ireland in her trade, manufactures, and agriculture; interests which, when rightly understood, mutually assist each other, and which may be considered together, being liable in most instances to be improved or injured by the same causes.

The advocates against a Union have used much subtlety, though, in general, little method or order, in arguing this part of the subject. As far as I have been able to arrange what they have said, they seem to contend that Ireland is now in a most flourishing situation, and in a state of progressive improvement; that she owes this, in the first place, to a compact under which her linen trade has been cultivated with the most happy success; and in the next, to that more solemn compact with Great Britain, 'the 'glorious

glorious conſtitution of 1782, which enabled her to legiſlate for herſelf, and ſecure, protect, and cheriſh by her own vigilant attention to the great objects of her proſperity, that trade, and all the other branches of her commerce, her manufactures, and her agriculture.

Theſe compacts they treat as binding and complete. They cannot be departed from, and nothing farther is wanting to the growing proſperity and ſafety of Ireland. But a Union would annul them, would ſhake or deſtroy every ſecurity which they have eſtabliſhed, and would ſubſtitute in their place, the capricious, ſelfiſh, and deſpotic will of an unjuſt, narrow-minded, and rapacious rival. Theſe, perhaps, are not the words, but I think they expreſs, and do not exaggerate the meaning of what has been frequently and very recently inſiſted upon.

Let us therefore a little inquire, but, as far as we can, with moderation and temper, the beſt companions of reaſon and juſtice, how theſe different allegations ſtand in point of fact. And firſt, as to the ſuppoſed compact concerning the linen trade.

It is admitted that Great Britain is the great cuſtomer of Ireland for that her ſtaple commodity; that we receive it for our home conſumption free of all duty; and encourage its re-exportation from hence to foreign parts by the ſame bounties which we beſtow on our own manufacture. This, I ſay, is admitted; but,—beſides endeavouring to extenuate the merit which it is feared this country might lay claim to for the liberality of ſuch conduct, by the hackneyed anſwer, that ſhe, like other ſtates and nations under like circumſtances, is governed in her tranſactions with Ireland merely by the impreſ-

ſion of her own benefit and advantage—it is ſtated, 'That this encouragement to the Iriſh linen trade is the effect of a ſpecial contract, by which, for a valuable conſideration, England became bound to grant and maintain it. The valuable conſideration was, the relinquiſhment by Ireland of her woollen export trade, in which ſhe had or might have become a dangerous rival. England had grown jealous of this rivality; her manufacturers and her Parliament had urged King William to check it; he had conſented, and had expreſſed that conſent in terms juſtly offenſive to Ireland; a negotiation enſued; and acts of each of the two Parliaments paſſed, by which Ireland engaged to withdraw from all competition as to woollen goods, on the condition that England would give that preference and aſſiſtance which ſhe does to the linen manufactory of Ireland; in conſequence of this treaty, the woollen fabrics, of which ſhe at that time exported to the amount of 110,000*l.* a year, were abandoned; they cannot be reſumed*; and therefore Great Britain cannot recall or cancel that obligation by which ſhe engaged herſelf to promote, in the manner alleged, the linen trade of that country.' Such is in ſubſtance the ſtatement made.

It is extraordinary, but true, that ſince theſe debates began, many perſons, not ill informed in matters of this ſort, and anxious to obtain correct information on the point now in queſtion, have avowed their ignorance, and unſucceſsful endeavours to obtain the knowledge of the documents and acts in which this ſuppoſed compact is contained, of its date, particular clauſes and proviſions, and of the ſanctions, whether of a ſtatutable or diplomatic nature, by which it was guarded. But what I have

* *Qu.* Why?

to add, is ſtill more extraordinary, and equally true, namely, that, ſuch as it was, it no longer exiſts, but was done away, and totally and entirely repealed and made void, many years ago, at the inſtance of Ireland herſelf; and that the advantages which Great Britain ſtill confers on the linen trade of Ireland, are, on her part, at the preſent hour, merely gratuitous, whatever may be the motives of generoſity, policy, or ſelf-intereſt, which induce her to continue them.

For my own part, I confeſs that I know of no ſatisfactory evidence of agreements or compacts between nations, except what are to be found in their diplomatic or legiſlative records. Between nations totally diſtinct, they muſt, to have ſubſtantial validity, be expreſſed in the ſtipulations of mutual and ſolemn treaties, duly executed; between countries connected as Ireland and England were, and as Ireland and Great Britain are, by acts of their reſpective Legiſlatures, paſſed with relation expreſs or implied each to the other, ſo as that the act on the one ſide ſhall be the condition and conſideration of that on the other ſide. I have accordingly endeavoured to trace the hiſtory of the buſineſs I am now diſcuſſing, in thoſe ſure, and only ſure, repoſitories of the national tranſactions of both countries with each other—their reſpective ſtatute-books;—and the correct reſult appears to me to be as follows:

Reſtrictive taxes had been laid ſo far back as the period of the Edwards, on the importation of woollen goods into this kingdom, whether from Ireland or any other country beyond ſeas. But not to go back to any earlier period than the Reſtoration, by the act of 12 Car. II. c. 4. ſ. 1. 8*s*. 6*d*. per yard were impoſed on all woollen

cloths, and 1*s.* 3*d.* on woollen ſtuffs*, imported into England. Theſe laſt-mentioned duties have never been repealed. They have indeed been increaſed to 1*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* per yard on cloth, and 5*s.* 6*d.* on ſtuffs, by the operation of new and general ſubſidies, affecting them in common with all other articles of importation. But the duty of 8*s.* 6*d.* per yard alone amounted, and would of itſelf ſtill amount, to an entire prohibition; for neither Ireland nor any country on earth could come in competition with this in her home market, if burdened with that duty. Thus ſtood the law at the period when the ſuppoſed bargain took place. The Houſe will ſee that England did not then want the concurrence of Ireland, nor had any occaſion to purchaſe that concurrence by any conceſſion on her part, in order to exclude Iriſh woollens from her own home market.

But it ſeems the Engliſh Legiſlature and Government of that time thought it good policy to liſten to the repreſentations, made by the Engliſh manufacturers, of the danger their ſtaple trade was expoſed to from the competition of the Iriſh in foreign countries. The Iriſh Parliament, on the other hand, ſeem to have been ſatisfied, that it was upon the whole for the intereſt of their country, to obtain the favour and protection of England to her linen manufactures, which had been even then carried to a conſiderable height, by an amicable underſtanding, and the relinquiſhment of that hoſtile competition in the woollen buſineſs abroad, which had occaſioned ſo much ill-humour on this ſide of the water.

* Note.—The duty was 12*d.* in the pound, or 5 per cent. on the value, as valued in the book of rates; and cloths were rated ſo high as 8*l.* 10*s.* per yard, ſtuffs at 1*l.* 5*s.*

Accordingly

Accordingly they paſſed a law, in the 10th year of William III.*, impoſing an *ad valorem* duty of 4*s*. in the pound on all broad cloth, and 2*s*. in the pound on ſerges, baize, &c. exported from Ireland to any part of the world. This amounted in effect to a prohibition; but no act was paſſed in England on the occaſion, to check or prohibit the exportation of Engliſh linens. Will it be ſaid, Ireland had reaſon to expect ſuch a law to paſs? where is the evidence of this?

The Engliſh Houſe of Lords, in an addreſs to the Throne, had indeed preſſed the King to declare, 'that 'if the woollen trade were relinquiſhed in Ireland, 'and the ſubjects there ſhould turn their induſtry and 'ſkill to the ſettling and improving the linen manufac-'ture, for which generally the lands of that kingdom 'were very proper, they ſhould receive all favour, coun-'tenance, and protection from his royal influence for 'the encouragement and promoting of the ſaid linen ma-'nufacture to all the advantage and profit that kingdom 'could be capable of †.'

The Engliſh Commons, in like manner, had implored the King to 'make it his royal care to diſcourage the 'woollen, and encourage the linen manufactures in 'Ireland, to which they ſaid they ſhould always be 'ready to give their utmoſt aſſiſtance ‡.'

And the King, in anſwer to this addreſs of the Com-

* Iriſh Statutes, 10 Will. III. c. 5.

† Journals of the Houſe of Lords, vol. xvi. p. 314. 9th June 1698.

‡ Journals of the Houſe of Commons, vol. xii. p. 337. 30th June 1698.

mons, had ſaid, 'I will do all that in me lies to diſ-
'courage the woollen manufacture in Ireland, and en-
'courage the linen manufacture there *.'

It was after this that the Iriſh act I have juſt mentioned paſſed.

The Engliſh laws at that time as to Iriſh linen ſtood thus: by the 7th and 8th William III. c. 39. Iriſh linen was made importable into England duty free; but a new ſubſidy of 5 per cent. on all goods imported, having been granted in the year after (8th and 9th William III. c. 24.), to continue till the 1ſt of February 1699, without any exception as to Iriſh linen, that article became liable to this new duty; and from the ſtate of the war in 1698, it was probable that this ſubſidy would be renewed, as it accordingly was from time to time, and continued for the life of Queen Anne; it may therefore be conjectured that the great wiſh of Ireland as to her linen trade then was, a reſtoration to the exemption granted by the firſt-mentioned act, ſo as again to open a free market for her linens in England.

That was not obtained during the remainder of William's reign; but early in the next, by 1 Ann. ſt. 2. c. 8. the importation of Iriſh linen into this country duty free was reſtored, and that has continued to be the law ever ſince.

Is it not therefore probable that Ireland was ſatisfied with this freedom of importing her linen goods, exempt from duty, into Great Britain? At leaſt the caſe certainly ſtands ſo on the face of the Acts of Parliament; and

* Journals of the Houſe of Commons, vol. xii. p. 339. 2d July 1698.

beſides what I have already mentioned to ſhow that they are the only ſure evidence on ſuch a ſubject, have we not ſufficient reaſon, from the almoſt inextricable diſcuſſions which the hiſtory of what paſſed in both countries in 1782 has given riſe to *, to avoid recurring for ſupplementary proof of I know not what implied equitable or underſtood conditions and ſtipulations, to anecdotes, harangues, or even entries which may be found on the Journals of either kingdom, but which gave riſe to no legiſlative proceeding?

The Iriſh act, which was only temporary, expired in 1702, and was not renewed; but a very ſtrong, and certainly harſh act, and not temporary, was paſſed in England (10th and 11th Will. III. c. 10.), totally prohibiting the exportation of Iriſh woollens to any foreign country. The power of the Engliſh Parliament to make ſuch a law was at that time ſtrenuouſly inſiſted upon in this country, and, if not acknowledged, at leaſt acquieſced under in Ireland; ſo that this laſt-mentioned ſtatute did in effect prevent the export to all foreign parts of Iriſh woollen cloths.

While this continued to be the caſe, it might have been unjuſt, and a breach of faith in England or Great Britain, to impoſe any duty, which might have cramped or injured the exportation of Iriſh linens, either to this or to foreign countries; but that has been ſo far from being done, even to this day, that, on the contrary, beſides the continuation of the free import, various Britiſh acts have given the ſame bounties to Iriſh as to Britiſh linens exported from hence; and by the impoſition of a heavy tax on

* The ground taken by the opponents of a Union has rendered thoſe diſcuſſions, in regard to the tranſactions of that period, unavoidable.

foreign linens brought into Great Britain, ſhe gives in that reſpect alſo an equal premium to the Iriſh as to her own manufacture. The bounty paid from the revenue of Great Britain on Iriſh linens exported has been computed to be, upon an average, upwards of 34,000*l.*

But does the condition on the part of Ireland ſtill continue? Is her part of the ſuppoſed compact ſtill in force; and did ſhe, when Great Britain renounced the claim to bind her by her ſtatutes, renew by any law of her own the prohibition of the exportation of her woollens? Quite the contrary. Before the boaſted æra of her independency, in the year 1779 and 1780, ſhe had wiſely, boldly, and ſucceſsfuly addreſſed to the Britiſh Government and Parliament her complaint, that this reſtriction was injurious to the induſtry and proſperity of her people; and by the Britiſh act of 20 George III. c. 6. the ſtatute of William III. was repealed, and a free exportation of her woollens allowed from Ireland to all foreign places.

It is the natural, obvious, and juſt obſervation of a writer on this ſubject, that 'This law, of courſe, put 'an end to the compact between England and Ireland, 'reſpecting the woollen and linen manufactures*.' This country has indeed ſtill continued her encouragement to the Iriſh linen trade, the free entry into Great Britain, and the bounties on exportation from thence; but ſhe has done ſo voluntarily, and without any tie, contract, or other obligation, but what the general principles of good policy may impoſe. One is therefore a good deal ſurpriſed to read in the addreſs of a Gentleman in Ireland, peculiarly diſtinguiſhed for his knowledge in ſuch matters, to his conſtituents, the following words:

* Continuation of Anderſon's Hiſt. of Commerce, vol. iv. p. 287.

'If

'If the linen manufactory reſts at all on any compact, 'that compact was made with the Iriſh Parliament; the 'extinction of which takes away a ſecurity we have 'found adequate, and leaves it without the protection 'of its natural guardians *.'

According to the ſame addreſs we are to believe, it ſeems, that as the compact in 1698 was and is the ſecurity for the linen trade of Ireland with Great Britain, ſo the more ſolemn and important compact of 1782, not only ſupplied a new guarantee to that ſecurity, by confirming to the former the birthright of a *ſole* † and independent Parliament, but alſo, by the ſame means, rouſed a *new* ſpirit of exertion in the traders and manufacturers in general of that kingdom, while a legiſlative Union would at once deſtroy the independence of the Parliament, becauſe it would be no longer ſolely Iriſh,

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Addreſs to the Freeholders of the County of Louth, 15th January 1799. The actual exiſtence of ſuch a compact has been more ſtrongly and directly aſſerted ſince. 'Britain is bound in every inſtance to encourage our linen trade by 'compact, ſo ſtrongly manifeſt in the proceedings of both Parlia-'ments, as cannot be denied.' Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 83.

† It appears to me that the word '*ſole*' may bear a ſenſe materially different as uſed in this addreſs, and as it ſtands in that of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons in 1782, to which this refers. The words of this addreſs to the electors of Louth are: 'The Houſe of 'Commons ſtated to his Majeſty in 1782, that the very eſſence of 'our liberties exiſts in the right of a *ſole Legiſlature*, the Parliament 'of Ireland.' This conveys to me the idea of a legiſlature which ſolely has juriſdiction over Ireland. The addreſs of 1782 ſays, 'Ireland is a diſtinct kingdom with a Parliament of her own, *the* '*ſole legiſlature* thereof.' This only expreſſes, as I underſtand it, that the Iriſh Parliament alone, without any concurrent right elſewhere, was the legiſlature of Ireland, without implying that that Parliament cannot be incorporated with that of Great Britain.

extinguiſh the ſpirit which had been awakened, and remove every ſafeguard of permanence to whatever advantages it might hold out as a temptation to thoſe weak and deluded perſons who might ignorantly form any opinion in its favour.

Much has been ſaid and much written on the ſubject of that tranſaction of 1782. It appears to me chiefly of importance, now, in as far as it may afford evidence of what the opinions were which eminent ſtateſmen on both ſides of the water then entertained, many of whom muſt be ſtill anxious to have thoſe opinions rightly underſtood. But, if their preſent ſentiments correſpond with what they formerly thought, this uniformity will be a ſtrong argument in favour of thoſe ſentiments, and, in that point of view, it becomes certainly a matter of public concern alſo, to aſcertain what they were. Whatever they were, however, they are not binding upon them; much leſs upon us, or upon either the Iriſh or Britiſh Parliament. Nay, no act of either Parliament of that time, would be binding on thoſe of the preſent day; and therefore had each Legiſlature ſeparately declared that they meant the arrangement, then made, to be ſuch a final adjuſtment of all relations between the two countries, as that no nearer and more intimate connexion, no legiſlative Union in a word, ſhould ever be formed between them, that declaration would not be obligatory now, nor ſtand in the way of the two preſent Legiſlatures entering upon, and, if for the benefit of both nations, concluding ſuch a legiſlative Union. I am unwilling to go far into the controverſy on the circumſtances of that buſineſs. Others, in all reſpects more competent, have diſcuſſed it at large, and it will probably be ſtill farther elucidated this night.

But

But I think I can prove that nothing which appears on the records, or uſual reports of the proceedings in Parliament, or on the face of the thing, ſhows that either party meant, on that occaſion, to ſhut out in future all queſtion of Union, but quite otherwiſe; that the progreſſive improvement in the trade, manufactures, and general proſperity of Ireland ſince, has not been owing to that tranſaction; that this proſperity is not ſecured by it; that it depends in a very principal degree on the policy and wiſdom of Great Britain; and that the only certain ſafeguard of its permanence would be found in that very meaſure, which it is pretended would have the contrary effect.

There were four grievances then ſtated on the part of Ireland: one and the principal of which was the claim of the Britiſh Parliament to a legiſlative power over that kingdom.

The meſſages from the Throne to both Parliaments mentioned 'the King's concern to find that diſcontents 'and jealouſies were prevailing *on matters of great weight* '*and importance*; and recommended that *the ſame* ſhould be 'taken into conſideration, in order to ſuch a *final* adjuſt-'ment* as might give mutual ſatisfaction to both king-'doms†.'

The addreſſes of the Iriſh Houſes ſpecified the four grievances, 'as the principal cauſes of the preſent diſ-'content and jealouſy' of that country. The only one

* Of what, in God's name? Surely, of thoſe matters of weight and importance, on which jealouſie and diſcontents were then prevailing.

† 9th April 1782.—16th April 1782.

of the four which a Britiſh act could redreſs, was the claim of legiſlation.

On the 17th of May a reſolution was come to in this Houſe, that the act aſſerting that claim ſhould be repealed, and immediately afterwards another, declaring it to be 'indiſpenſable to the intereſts of both kingdoms 'that the connexion between them ſhould be eſtabliſhed 'by mutual conſent on a ſolid and permanent baſis.'

This laſt reſolution, and the addreſs by which it was communicated to his Majeſty, both conſidered by themſelves and in the connexion of this with the other reſolution which preceded, have given riſe to a great deal of what I muſt take the liberty to call ingenious cavil and chicane. The Right Honourable Gentleman who moved the reſolutions, now propoſed to be carried to the foot of the Throne, in mentioning that addreſs of 1782, had expreſſed what he had endeavoured to prove to be its true import and meaning, viz. 'that his Majeſty would take '*farther* meaſures to ſtrengthen the connexion between 'the two countries;' on which it has been remarked, with a hypercritical nicety, that the *word* 'farther' is not in the addreſs.—Neither, I believe, is the word 'ſtrengthen.' —But the point is, whether the *meaning* was not, that meaſures ulterior to thoſe then propoſed were in the contemplation of the Houſe when it came to the reſolution and voted the addreſs.—I ſay they clearly were. What is the argument triumphantly preſſed to ſhow the contrary? Why, that the *reſolution* and *addreſs* were voted *before* the *bill* for repealing the declaratory act of George I. and renouncing the claim to bind Ireland, was preſented*. Surely, Sir, this is a ſtrange fallacy.

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 19.

The

The Miniſter of the day, when he moved the two reſolutions, is ſtated to have introduced them by a ſpeech mentioning the four grievances of Ireland, the claim of legiſlation, Poyning's act, the mutiny bill, and the appellate juriſdiction. The firſt, he ſaid, was to be redreſſed here, the others by acts to which the Lord Lieutenant was to be inſtructed to give the royal aſſent in Ireland; and *after* having explained this clearly and forcibly, he proceeded to expreſs himſelf to the following effect:

'That Ireland could have no reaſon to complain; 'the terms acceded to by England, were propoſed by 'herſelf; the manner of redreſs had been preſcribed by 'herſelf, and all her wiſhes would now be gratified in 'the way which ſhe herſelf liked beſt: but as it was 'poſſible, that if nothing *more was to be done, than what 'he had ſtated to be his intention*, Ireland might perhaps 'think of freſh grievances, and riſe yearly in her de-'mands, *it was fit and proper that ſomething ſhould be now 'done towards eſtabliſhing on a firm and ſolid baſis the future 'connexion of the two kingdoms*. But that was not to be 'propoſed by him here in Parliament; it would be the 'duty of the Crown to look to that; the buſineſs might 'be firſt begun by his Majeſty's ſervants in Ireland; and 'if afterwards it ſhould be neceſſary to enter into a treaty, 'commiſſioners might be ſent from the Britiſh Parliament, 'or from the Crown, to enter upon it, and bring the ne-'gotiation to a happy iſſue, by giving mutual ſatisfaction 'to both countries, and eſtabliſhing a treaty which 'ſhould be ſanctioned by the moſt ſolemn forms of the 'conſtitutions of both *.'

* Mr. *Fox*'s Speech, 17th May 1782. Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. vii. p. 172.

Is

Is it poſſible, after reading this, which there is no reaſon to believe to be an inaccurate report as to the ſubſtance of what the Right Honourable Gentleman ſaid, that it can be imagined or ſeriouſly argued that no ulterior, no *farther* meaſures were then in his contemplation and in that of the Miniſtry, whoſe organ he was, and of which he formed ſo eminent a part?

This difficulty ſeems indeed to have been a little felt, and therefore another method is attempted of reconciling to what really then paſſed, the idea that all political or conſtitutional arrangements were meant by the parties to this buſineſs of 1782 to be finally cloſed, ſo as that this country could never, with good faith, agitate in future, or propoſe to Ireland for her conſideration and voluntary adoption or rejection, any thing of that ſort. 'The fact,' we are told, 'ſeems to be, that the reſolu-'tion, in reſpect to *future* meaſures, (where is the mighty 'difference between *future* and *farther?)* had *commerce* '*only* in view*.' But, Sir, what does the ſame Miniſter ſay on that point? He is ſtated to have declared in this Houſe, in 1785, 'That *no idea of a com-'mercial regulation* had been entertained by the admini-'ſtration of 1782, in propoſing the reſolution in queſ-'tion†.'

After the Duke of Portland communicated the two reſolutions of 1782 to the Iriſh Houſe of Commons‡, and informed them alſo of the King's diſpoſition to give his aſſent to bills to be paſſed there for redreſſing the other grievances, they aſſure his Majeſty, in a new

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 21.

† Mr. *Fox*'s Speech, 22d July 1785. Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. xviii. p. 577.

‡ 27th May 1782.

addreſs,

addreſs, 'That, gratified in thoſe particulars, *no conſti-*
'*tutional queſtion* between the two nations *will any longer*
'*exiſt*, which can interrupt their harmony *.'

In the anſwer to this, the King told them 'that
'this declaration was very pleaſing to him†.'

At the cloſe of the ſeſſion, the Commons ſay to the Lord Lieutenant, 'We ſhall have ſeen this great national
'arrangement (the ſole and excluſive right of legiſlation
'in that Parliament) eſtabliſhed on a baſis which ſecures
'the tranquillity of Ireland, and unites the affections as
'well as intereſts of both kingdoms ‡.'

Laſtly, for I think I have now quoted all the paſſages on which the chief ſtreſs has been laid, his Grace, in his ſpeech on the prorogation, ſays, 'Convince the
'people in your ſeveral diſtricts, as you yourſelves are
'convinced, that every cauſe of *paſt* jealouſies and diſ-
'contents is *finally* removed; that both countries have
'pledged their good faith to each other; and that their
'beſt ſecurity will be an inviolable adherence to that
'compact: convince them that the two kingdoms are
'now one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of conſtitu-
'tion and unity of intereſts §.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I muſt confeſs I cannot ſee any thing in all this but the expreſſion of, firſt, an opinion that the *paſt* cauſes of diſcontent and jealouſy were then *finally* removed; and what has happened to prove that they were not? Has the Parliament of Great Britain renewed her claim to bind Ireland? Has there not been an annual mutiny act in Ireland ever ſince? Has

* 28th May 1782. † 13th June 1782.
‡ 23d July 1782. § 27th July 1782.

Poyning's

Poyning's law; has the appellate jurisdiction of this country been restored? Secondly, a hope, somewhat too sanguine perhaps, that no question on constitutional points would any longer exist between the two nations. This hope the Irish House of Commons expressed in the form of an assertion, which it would seem his Majesty was no farther advised to adopt than by declaring the pleasure it gave him to find they entertained that belief. But does it follow from thence, that either Parliament meant to preclude themselves from treating together on any measure which the King might recommend, or they think beneficial to both countries? By the phrase 'constitutional questions which might interrupt their harmony,' was clearly meant, disputes and claims on the one part or the other; not proposals from the one to the other, or from the Sovereign to both, which either might approve or reject as they saw fit. Such is the present proposal, which I therefore think they never meant to bind themselves not to entertain; which they could not conclude us, their successors in both kingdoms, from entertaining; which in my conscience I believe many of the wisest and best men in both then hoped might, some time or other, be brought forward with success; which the second resolution I have mentioned, as come to by this House, and received with satisfaction in Ireland, seems in some degree to suggest; and which, when I recollect the reports I have read and heard of the Minister's speech who moved those resolutions, I can never cease thinking his mind was full of on the occasion *, till I shall learn that he himself has declared the contrary.

* I do not say he had it expressly in contemplation then or afterwards to propose it. In his speech on the 22d of July 1785, he is reported to have 'spoken of the circumstance of a Union as 'extremely desirable.' Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 344.

Is it to be taken for granted, that the improvement beyond example which the trade, manufactures, and wealth of the people of Ireland are ſaid to have experienced during the laſt ſixteen or ſeventeen years, muſt be aſcribed to the renunciation by this country of the claim to legiſlate for them? It ſeems very difficult to ſee how a mere negative act of that ſort could poſſibly have ſuch an effect. Had the Britiſh Legiſlature, by its uſurped authority over that country for many years previous to that time, interfered with the internal or external commerce of Ireland? had the Iriſh Parliament been reſtrained from regulating and encouraging that commerce (the export woollen trade excepted) in the way they might think moſt likely to promote its increaſe? or did the abolition of the appeal to the Britiſh Houſe of Lords produce a new influx of Britiſh capital into Ireland?

The great points gained by Ireland from this country as to commerce have, I believe, hitherto been conſidered to have been the fruit of thoſe ſeveral acts of the Britiſh Parliament in 1779 and 1780*, of which one has been already obſerved upon, and which firſt opened to her a general freedom of trade, not only with the reſt of the world, but with our American and Weſt India colonies, the beſt mart for her commodities as well as ours. And if the advantages then obtained have been farther improved by the permiſſion to trade with thoſe colonies in every reſpect on the ſame footing as Great Britain does, which was granted in 1793†; was the Britiſh act of that year giving

* 19 Geo. III. c. 35. 19 Geo. III. c. 37. 20 Geo. III. c. 6. 20 Geo. III. c. 10. 20 Geo. III. c. 18.

† 33 Geo. III. c. 63.

ſuch permiſſion a conſequence of what has been called the emancipation of Ireland?

But, Sir, I think ſome here muſt know, and many may recollect to have heard, that Ireland was growing faſt in induſtry, enterpriſe, manufactures, trade, and agriculture, long before either the acknowledgment of her independence, or the grant of what was called a free trade. Indeed I believe it will be found, whatever may have been the cauſe, that all the three kingdoms, and his Majeſty's dominions in general, have flouriſhed with an *accelerated* degree of rapidity in all the branches of national exertion productive of trade and wealth, for a period of about fifty years, to be dated from the time of the general pacification of Europe by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

With regard to Ireland, beſides general memory, I might appeal to the weighty teſtimony recorded by Mr. *Arthur Young*, of the late Lord Chief Baron *Foſter*, in whoſe family an enlightened attention to political economy and the ſources of national proſperity ſeems to be hereditary. In Mr. *Young*'s account of a viſit he paid to that learned perſon during his tour through Ireland in the year 1776, he ſays he gave him a variety of information relative to the ſtate of that country uncommonly valuable, and among other things mentions his having told him, 'that 'Ireland was more improved in the laſt twenty years than 'in a century before; that the great ſpirit began in 1749 'and 1750*; that thirty years before the export of linen

'and

* *Young*'s Tour in Ireland, vol. i. p. 153. *Agricultural* improvement ſeems to have been a very principal object of Lord Chief Baron *Foſter*'s attention and practice, and the converſations mentioned by Mr. *Young* related in a great degree to that object; it

'and yarn was only about 500,000*l.* but that it was then 'from 1,200,000*l.* to 1,500,000*l.**'—that is, it had been nearly trebled in that time. By the ſame proportion and progreſs, if only the ſame cauſes which then exiſted, and had produced the great ſpirit mentioned by Lord Chief Baron *Foſter*, had continued to operate, this export would, in ſix or ſeven years hence, amount to four millions and a half. Now, Sir, with all the ſuppoſed aſſiſtance it has derived from the tranſaction of 1782, when a fair account is taken, it will not be found to have gone on increaſing in that ratio. The annual *rated* value of Iriſh exports of every ſort to all parts of the world, of which proviſions made probably more than one third †, is ſtated from the official accounts of that country, on an average of the three years ending on the 25th of March 1798, to have been in Iriſh money only 4,642,779*l.* ‡ I own therefore I think it much more reaſonable that we ſhould aſcribe the growing improvement of Ireland in the chief article of her manufacture to the ſpirit which began in 1750, and appears to have continued in full force during the interval between that time and the date of Mr. *Young*'s tour, than either to a *new* ſpirit ſaid to have been rouſed by the arrangement of 1782, an arrangement which had no direct

it has been lately ſtated, however, 'that the riſe of *agriculture* 'began in Ireland with the conſtitution of 1782.'—Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 105.

* *Young*'s Tour, vol. i. p. 151.

† By Mr. *Irving*'s Tables, out of 5,612,689*l.* the *true* annual value of all the exports from Ireland to Great Britain on the average of the ſame three years, proviſions, excluſive of corn and live cattle, amounted to 1,954,113*l.*—Accounts laid before the Houſe of Lords, No. 4. 16.

‡ Vide Appendix to Lord *Auckland*'s Speech, No. 9.

connexion with ſuch objects, or even to the Britiſh acts of 1780, which had.

The next queſtion is, Whether the arrangement of 1782, though it may not have cauſed, does not ſecure the permanent continuance of a flouriſhing commerce to Ireland? After what has been ſaid, this queſtion ſeems to anſwer itſelf; yet we find that tranſaction alleged to be the foundation of ſuch ſecurity, and which it is ſuppoſed a Union would entirely take away. Did the acts of the 22d of Geo. III. c. 53. and 23d Geo. III. c. 28. while they renounced all power in this Parliament to make laws to bind Ireland, impoſe any indiſſoluble reſtraint on Great Britain, as to the repeal of whatever Britiſh ſtatutes might then exiſt, or might in future be enacted, of a nature beneficial to that country?

We have ſeen in part the encouragement the Iriſh linen trade derives from mere Britiſh laws; and it might here be a proper time to take a more general and connected view of all the commercial advantages Ireland enjoys, both in that and other reſpects, ſolely under thoſe laws; in order to ſhow how vain, I had almoſt ſaid how extravagant, the arguments have been, however ably and ſkilfully conducted, by which it has been attempted to be proved that the balance is *even* between that country and this, or rather preponderates on the ſide of Ireland. But ſuch general ſtatements have been made already more than once, both here and in the Iriſh Parliament, and are now to be found in a variety of authentic publications. I will content myſelf, therefore, with trying to point out ſome of the fallacies belonging to the endeavours which have been uſed to ſhow thoſe ſtatements to be erroneous.

It is admitted that the great market for Iriſh linen is this country. On the annual average of the four years preceding Lady Day 1798, of about forty millions of yards exported, near thirty-five were ſent to Great Britain, and the Britiſh colonies and iſlands; or ſeven-eighths of the whole*. This immenſe quantity was imported duty free, and a great part of what was re-exported received a bounty; while all foreign linens imported here were charged with a duty, variouſly computed, at from above 33 to about 25 ½ per cent. Taking it at the loweſt, is not this a bounty to the amount of no leſs than one-fourth of the value, on Iriſh linen goods brought into this kingdom? and is it not a

	Yards.
* To Great Britain - -	33,695,659
The Britiſh colonies -	1,285,999
	34,981,658
The States of America -	4,012,589
All other parts - -	891,533
Total -	39,885,780

This is the account according to the Iriſh returns. By the Inſpector General's books here, the importation into England that year was, as I have ſtated below (p. 70), 35,338,000.

† The bounty is confined to linens, whether Britiſh or Iriſh, not under 6*d.* nor exceeding 1*s.* 6*d.* per yard.

‡ Foreign linens, in general, are not ſubject to an *ad valorem* duty, but to a certain rate, per ell or per 100 ells; and almoſt every ſpecies of linen is minutely deſcribed in the acts impoſing the duty: as, Ruſſia, broad, above 22½ inches wide; Germany, narrow, not exceeding ſo many inches, &c. But as ſome ſorts might have been omitted in the ſpecific enumeration, there is a ſweeping clauſe, laying 33⅓ per cent. on the value of all linens not particularly deſcribed. Scarcely any, however, are in fact imported which are not deſcribed. The Inſpector General informs me, that on a correct eſtimate he endeavoured to make about ſix months ago, of the real price of foreign linens imported, he found the duty on the average of the whole importation, to be about 25 per cent,

difficult taſk for any body to undertake to contend, 'that 'thoſe linens would (to any conſiderable extent) find their 'way here even though there were no duty on the foreign'*.

It is indeed ſtated, and I have no doubt correctly, that Iriſh linens have riſen of late not leſs than 35 per cent. above their uſual value†. Sir, I have endeavoured to inform myſelf of the cauſes of this extraordinary riſe, and I believe it will be found to be owing partly to the reduced quantity manufactured on the continent, and at the ſame time an increaſed demand in conſequence of the war, and partly to unwiſe and unprofitable ſpeculations occaſioned by that circumſtance. It ſeems the demand for ſhirting for the different armies of Europe has been immenſe, and conſiderable quantities of Iriſh linens have alſo been lately ſent, directly or circuitouſly, to Spain and Portugal, and likewiſe to ſome of our Weſt India iſlands‡, to be exported from thence to South America, as a ſubſtitute for thoſe of German manufacture which uſed to be ſent there, but which are now become too ſcarce to be ſufficient for the ſupply of that market. In confirmation of this, it appears, on inſpecting the Britiſh accounts of imports and exports, that during the two years preceding the preſent, the import of linen from Ireland into this country diminiſhed conſiderably, while the re-exportation increaſed. In 1797, the Iriſh linen imported amounted to 39,868,000 yards, and the re-exportation was but 3,889,830; laſt year the importation was only 35,338,000 yards, and the re-exportation 6,590,456. From the ſame ſources of information, which I believe I may ſtate to be as authentic, both

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 89. † Ibid.

‡ In conſequence of permiſſions granted by the government of this country about a year and a half ago to open a commercial communication between ſome of thoſe iſlands and the Spaniſh continent.

mercantile

mercantile and official, as can be obtained, I learn that foreign linens, particularly thoſe which are uſed for the ſame purpoſes with the Iriſh, have riſen in their price nearly in the ſame proportion with them; if they have not riſen quite ſo much, this is aſcribed to the unthriſty and hazardous ſpeculations I have mentioned.

But let us take it the other way, and ſuppoſe the 25 per cent. duty to be extended to the Iriſh linen. Will it be ſaid, that ſuch a burden on the trade to this country in that article, would not put a ſtop to it? Will it be ſo ſaid, by thoſe who have very juſtly remarked, that the ſmaller charge of 20 per cent. on its general export, entirely 'put down the woollen trade of Ireland*?' If it would not put a ſtop to it, Ireland is certainly obliged to Great Britain for her generoſity or rather profuſion, in remitting to her an annual duty it ſeems ſhe could afford to pay of from half a million to a million ſterling.

In an account produced to the Houſe of Lords by that very able and accurate officer the Inſpector General, the true value of all the products and manufactures of Ireland imported into this country, on the average of the three years preceding the 5th of January laſt, is ſtated at about five millions and a half†, while that of the exports of the ſame ſort, from hence to Ireland, amounted to little above two‡; the exceſs being near three millions and a half§. On the groſs view, therefore, of this ſort of debtor and creditor account, Ireland appears to be a gainer to that amount, in conſequence of the preſent commercial

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 83.

† 5,510,825*l.*
‡ 2,087,672*l.*
§ 3,425,153*l.*
} Accounts laid before the Houſe of Lords, No. 15.

code,

code, not of that, but of this country. There are, I believe, conſiderable differences between the Iriſh and Engliſh official details on theſe ſubjects, and any minutely exact computation of the true value cannot be expected. But it will alſo be admitted, that there is great reliance to be had on the accounts which come from Mr. *Irving*'s office; and it is well known that he has taken much pains of late to get at the actual value of all the exports and imports of Great Britain. I am therefore inclined to think that the above may be taken, for the purpoſes of the preſent argument, as ſufficiently correct.

By a ſimilar account of the ſame officer, alſo preſented to the Lords, the true value of the total imports from Ireland into this country, was, on the like average, 5,612,689*l.*; that of the exports from hence thither, 3,555,845*l.*; leaving, on this compariſon, not ſo great an exceſs indeed, but ſtill an apparent balance of 2,056,844*l.* in favour of Ireland *.

But we are told †, that upon a proper examination of the articles which compoſe the groſs ſums in theſe accounts, the real balance will be found to be much in favour of Great Britain.

To make this out, the objects of the mutual trade of the two kingdoms are claſſed under the three heads of, 1. manufactures; 2. raw materials, &c.; and, 3. foreign articles. The particulars are then arranged in ſuch a manner as to make it appear, 1ſt, that Ireland takes from Great Britain to the amount of 14,000*l.* a

* Accounts laid before the Houſe of Lords, No. 16.

† Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 80.

year

year more, under the firſt head, than Great Britain does from her: 2d, that ſhe ſupplies Britain with an exceſs of raw materials, including articles of prime neceſſity, to the amount of no leſs than 2,463,447*l.*: and, 3d, that the exceſs of the foreign articles exported from this country into Ireland, over the ſimilar imports from thence into this country, is 1,366,309*l.*

This is a very different method of ſtating the caſe from what has been uſual, at leaſt as far as I have been able to inform myſelf. I certainly feel how unequal I am to enter the liſts on points of this ſort with the Gentleman who has thus ſtated it on the preſent occaſion; but I have endeavoured, with the aſſiſtance of thoſe who are more accuſtomed to ſuch matters than I pretend to be, to aſcertain whether the right clue might not be found to this ſeeming refutation of the hitherto received opinion, that the profitable balance is very greatly in favour of Ireland. I think it may, and I will attempt to explain myſelf in regard to it, in the beſt manner I can.

1. To the amount of Britiſh manufactures taken off by Ireland, which, by Mr. *Irving*'s tables, is but 1,640,195*l.* have been added all the articles brought either from our American colonies or the Eaſt Indies, the value of which is not leſs than 970,000*l.* *

'Much of this,' we are told, 'is real manufacture†, 'and that the reſt may be deemed ſo, on account of the 'employ of labour in the colony, and of the ſhipping‡.'

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 80.

† Scarcely any part of the goods brought from the Weſt Indies and America can be conſidered as ſuch.

‡ Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, ibid.

But ſurely it can never be intended ſeriouſly to maintain, that Great Britain profits as much by the induſtry, ſkill, and labour employed by the people of the Eaſt and Weſt Indies in manufacturing for the uſe of theſe kingdoms their own raw materials, as Ireland does by thoſe of her inhabitants engaged in her domeſtic fabrics. Indeed, as to the Britiſh Weſt Indian and American colonies, it ſeems to me that ſince a full participation in the trade with them has been opened to Ireland, the opulence acquired by manufactures or otherwiſe in thoſe parts of the Britiſh dominions, in as far as it is not to be conſidered as merely local, merely Weſt Indian or American, is to be reckoned not Britiſh more than Iriſh, but imperial; and this is alſo true as to the Eaſt Indies, ſuppoſing the Iriſh act of 1793* to have ſecured to Ireland as great a ſhare of commercial intercourſe with that country as ſhe had in any way the means of carrying on; a ſuppoſition more than warranted by the little or rather I believe no uſe ſhe has made of the privilege ſince ſhe obtained it.

With regard to the ſhipping, undoubtedly Great Britain is a gainer by carrying the Eaſt and Weſt India articles required for the conſumption of Ireland. But could Ireland, all circumſtances conſidered, obtain thoſe articles ſo beneficially in any other way? Her own tonnage is not equal to the carriage of her own produce and manufactures to this country; and in the preſent ſtate of things, even the reſt of Europe is almoſt entirely ſupplied by Great Britain, notwithſtanding the protection the naval commerce of ſeveral other ſtates derives from their neutrality. When to theſe conſiderations we add the immenſe variety of channels of a more advantageous nature, in a mercan-

* Iriſh Acts, 33 Geo. III. c. 31.

tile

tile view, in which it is well known that the Britiſh capital veſted in this branch of her carrying trade might be employed, we ſhall not eaſily be perſuaded to place whatever gain ariſes from it to the credit ſide of Ireland, in ſettling accounts between that country and this.

2. Under the general head of raw materials, &c. exported from Ireland, have been included, by the deſcription of articles of prime neceſſity, beef, butter, pork, corn, and other proviſions; Iriſh linen yarn is alſo claſſed under this head; while cheeſe, fiſh, ſuch as cod and herrings, &c. and raw ſilk and cotton yarn, are articles claſſed as manufactures among the Britiſh exports.

But in compariſons of this ſort, the expreſſion of 'raw 'materials' has been generally uſed to ſignify matters which conſtitute the baſis of a manufacture, and contribute thereby much more to the wealth of the country to which they are carried, and where they are worked up, than in their rude ſtate they had done to that of the country ſupplying them, In this ſenſe beef, corn, &c. cannot with any propriety be ranked under that deſcription; they add nothing to the wealth of the country importing them; they continue juſt worth the price at firſt paid for them*, and in the caſe under our conſideration, if not obtained from Ireland, the ſame capital would probably procure them elſewhere, or might be directed to the production of them at home.

3. Although the ſum of 970,000*l.* by the title of colonial goods, had been added under the firſt of theſe

* We are not here to reckon the mere mercantile profit they may afford in their unaltered ſtate; the price paid for them would have furniſhed a like profit employed in any other way, and will, having been ſo employed, furniſh a like profit to the ſeller.

But ſurely it can never be intended ſeriouſly to maintain, that Great Britain profits as much by the induſtry, ſkill, and labour employed by the people of the Eaſt and Weſt Indies in manufacturing for the uſe of theſe kingdoms their own raw materials, as Ireland does by thoſe of her inhabitants engaged in her domeſtic fabrics. Indeed, as to the Britiſh Weſt Indian and American colonies, it ſeems to me that ſince a full participation in the trade with them has been opened to Ireland, the opulence acquired by manufactures or otherwiſe in thoſe parts of the Britiſh dominions, in as far as it is not to be conſidered as merely local, merely Weſt Indian or American, is to be reckoned not Britiſh more than Iriſh, but imperial; and this is alſo true as to the Eaſt Indies, ſuppoſing the Iriſh act of 1793* to have ſecured to Ireland as great a ſhare of commercial intercourſe with that country as ſhe had in any way the means of carrying on; a ſuppoſition more than warranted by the little or rather I believe no uſe ſhe has made of the privilege ſince ſhe obtained it.

With regard to the ſhipping, undoubtedly Great Britain is a gainer by carrying the Eaſt and Weſt India articles required for the conſumption of Ireland. But could Ireland, all circumſtances conſidered, obtain thoſe articles ſo beneficially in any other way? Her own tonnage is not equal to the carriage of her own produce and manufactures to this country; and in the preſent ſtate of things, even the reſt of Europe is almoſt entirely ſupplied by Great Britain, notwithſtanding the protection the naval commerce of ſeveral other ſtates derives from their neutrality. When to theſe conſiderations we add the immenſe variety of channels of a more advantageous nature, in a mercan-

* Iriſh Acts, 33 Geo. III. c. 31.

tile

tile view, in which it is well known that the Britiſh capital veſted in this branch of her carrying trade might be employed, we ſhall not eaſily be perſuaded to place whatever gain ariſes from it to the credit ſide of Ireland, in ſettling accounts between that country and this.

2. Under the general head of raw materials, &c. exported from Ireland, have been included, by the deſcription of articles of prime neceſſity, beef, butter, pork, corn, and other proviſions; Iriſh linen yarn is alſo claſſed under this head; while cheeſe, fiſh, ſuch as cod and herrings, &c. and raw ſilk and cotton yarn, are articles claſſed as manufactures among the Britiſh exports.

But in compariſons of this ſort, the expreſſion of 'raw 'materials' has been generally uſed to ſignify matters which conſtitute the baſis of a manufacture, and contribute thereby much more to the wealth of the country to which they are carried, and where they are worked up, than in their rude ſtate they had done to that of the country ſupplying them. In this ſenſe beef, corn, &c. cannot with any propriety be ranked under that deſcription; they add nothing to the wealth of the country importing them; they continue juſt worth the price at firſt paid for them*, and in the caſe under our conſideration, if not obtained from Ireland, the ſame capital would probably procure them elſewhere, or might be directed to the production of them at home.

3. Although the ſum of 970,000*l.* by the title of colonial goods, had been added under the firſt of theſe

* We are not here to reckon the mere mercantile profit they may afford in their unaltered ſtate; the price paid for them would have furniſhed a like profit employed in any other way, and will, having been ſo employed, furniſh a like profit to the ſeller.

three heads to the amount of Britiſh manufactures exported to Ireland, it is here retained to make up the groſs ſum of 1,468,173*l.* as the value of foreign articles taken by Ireland from Great Britain, and is thus twice charged againſt this country: this has clearly happened by miſtake, though it makes a moſt material difference indeed in the reſult.

But it is ſaid 'the exceſs of gain to Great Britain muſt 'appear prodigious, if we conſider that of all that groſs 'ſum of near a million and a half, only 407,000*l.* is Eaſt 'India trade; and that what remains, to the value of above 'a million, is open to be imported direct to Ireland, were 'ſhe obliged or *inclined* to import it ſo*.' Undoubtedly it is open to her; but if ſhe could do it to advantage, will any man who knows the nature of trade ſuppoſe that ſhe would not have the *inclination*, but would ſuffer Great Britain to gain from her what ſhe does by thus acting as her carrier? The truth is, ſhe wants ſhipping and capital, what ſhe has being neceſſarily occupied to better advantage, or for more neceſſary purpoſes; and ſuch being the caſe, can we in fairneſs be required to ſet this down as a benefit which Great Britain holds at the good-will of her ſiſter kingdom?

Thus, Sir, I think we muſt ſtill retain the belief hitherto ſo prevalent with the generality of thoſe in both countries, who have moſt deeply conſidered ſuch matters, that in their commercial intercourſe the balance between them is greatly in favour of Ireland; and it follows of courſe, that Ireland, in the preſent relative ſituation of the two kingdoms, muſt depend entirely on the policy and wiſdom of the Britiſh Parliament for the continuance of what-

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 81.

ever

ever part of her general proſperity ſhe derives from that ſource.

This indeed is ſometimes * admitted: it is admitted that Great Britain, by what is called a war of duties and prohibitions, might injure Ireland for a time; of this America, it is ſaid, affords ample proof; but that Britain herſelf muſt ſuffer in ſuch a conteſt, and that her wiſdom, her liberality, and her own intereſt will forbid her entering into ſuch hoſtilities. I entirely agree in the poſition that it is not only liberal, but wiſe, and for her own advantage, that the preſent ſyſtem ſhould be perſevered in by this country, though I regret that America ſhould have been unneceſſarily mentioned, and this at the very time, and as it were with the ſame breath with which the Right Hon. Gentleman who has propoſed a Union, was in my opinion moſt unjuſtly accuſed of holding out *threats* to induce Ireland to accede to it. Alas! Sir, have we then no inſtances where the wiſeſt nations have departed from the line of ſound policy, and by the operation of various cauſes on the natural frailty of human counſels and conduct, adopted meaſures at once injurious to themſelves and their neighbours; or is wiſdom of conduct to be the poſſeſſion in perpetuity—the excluſive right—of all the ſucceſſive Adminiſtrations and Parliaments which, in all times to come, are to hold the reins of government, and exerciſe the functions of legiſlation in Great Britain? Should the principles which now prevail on commercial ſubjects loſe their influence; ſhould diſputes, prejudices, paſſion, and animoſity, ever take their place in adjuſting the relations of trade between the two iſlands; to what binding laws, to what inviola-

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 90, 91.

ble

ble treaty can Ireland appeal? or what will then avail towards compelling the admiſſion of her commodities into the Britiſh ports and markets, or the exportation of what ſhe may want from thence, her own Parliament, the ſuppoſed adequate guardian of her trade, its vigilance, its regulations, and its bounties? Will the independence and diſtinctneſs of that Parliament be able to ward off the blow, which on ſuch a ſuppoſition may be aimed at her proſperity, when ſhe ſhall have ſhut her ears to that warning voice which now calls upon her to liſten to the ſalutary meaſure by which alone ſhe can be really and completely ſecured againſt the poſſibility of ſuch an evil?

We are, it is true, too apt to think, when we think ſuperficially, that our deſcendants will never relapſe into errors ſimilar to thoſe of our forefathers, from which we have eſcaped; and that what appears right and wiſe to us, muſt be thought ſo by them. But does experience confirm this opinion? Thoſe who have attended to the great and numerous fluctuations of ſyſtem in our national policy foreign and domeſtic, will, I believe, decide otherwiſe.

> We think our fathers fools, ſo wiſe we grow;
> Our wiſer ſons, no doubt, will think us ſo—

is the ſenſible, though perhaps not very poetical reflection of a great and ſagacious poet. Have we not heard the obſolete notion of making Ireland a Britiſh garriſon, revived in this Houſe, and from a moſt reſpectable quarter? On the preſent occaſion it was indeed, I think, a ſingle, and, if the Hon. Gentleman will pardon the expreſſion, a ſingular opinion; but a change of times and circumſtances may perhaps render it leſs ſo. I dread to

reflect on the poſſibility of its ever becoming reaſonable; thoſe, however, who will have to determine, may think it ſo, when the ſentiments of none of us can have any ſhare in the deliberation.

What was the caſe of Scotland? every body muſt now admit that, being under the ſame king, who was alſo head of both Parliaments, and with the rules of ſucceſſion to the crown (till the Revolution) the ſame in both kingdoms, it would have been the intereſt of England to have encouraged the trade of Scotland, and conferred upon her every favour that could have tended to increaſe her proſperity. But how different was the conduct ſhe actually held to her? Was the Parliament of Scotland leſs independent than the Iriſh Parliament has been ſince 1782? and does it not appear from hiſtory that Scotland was to the full as deſirous, had ſhe had the means of eſtabliſhing a national commerce, and rivalling in her proportion the trade and manufactures of the neighbouring kingdom, as Ireland can now poſſibly be to retain and augment thoſe which ſhe at preſent poſſeſſes?

In 1785, thoſe perſons in Ireland who in my opinion had the beſt knowledge of her intereſts, did not think the advantages ſhe then enjoyed from her commercial connexion with Great Britain, were ſufficiently ſafe under the ſhield of Britiſh acts and Britiſh policy; 'they wiſh-'ed to have the ſecurity of a legiſlative compact*,' and this country was deſirous to give them that ſecurity, in as binding and permanent a form as was compatible with the exiſtence of diſtinct Legiſlatures. The miſtaken jealouſy of ſpeculative independence defeated the plan. It

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 87.

is now propoſed to give them a legiſlative ſecurity of a much more binding nature, one as indiſſoluble as human wiſdom can deviſe or imagine; but we are now told by ſome of the ſtrongeſt advocates for the much more imperfect meaſure of that year, even in reſpect to commerce, that a compact by Union, to diſſolve which no legitimate authority would any longer exiſt in either country, would be a meaſure pregnant with danger and miſchief to Iriſh trade and manufactures *. Sir, with what ſucceſs the conſiſtency of theſe ſentiments has been contended for, I ſhall leave to others to determine; it is now, it ſeems, thought ſafeſt ſolely to truſt to 'a connexion riveted on the 'intereſts, the ſentiments, and the affections of both na-'tions, and thoſe rivets cloſed and kept firm by the regula-'tions of 1782 †.'

Some admit that there are commercial benefits ſtill left for Great Britain to beſtow; that a perfectly free communication between the two iſlands, a complete interchange of commodities of all ſorts, without the charge of any kind of duty in their tranſit from the one to the other, would greatly redound to the advantage of Ireland; that ſhe would then ſend more manufactured goods to Great Britain than ſhe yet does, and receive a greater quantity and variety of raw materials from thence. But then it is aſked, why ſhould not this country complete her ſyſtem of liberality to the ſiſter kingdom? That is in one moment called liberality, which in another is deſcribed as mere ſelfiſhneſs, or an unwilling ranſom extorted by intimidation. Why ſhould ſhe not grant to Ireland, without the condition of a Union, what by benefiting her muſt alſo benefit herſelf?

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 91.

† Ibid. p. 109. Vide alſo p. 48. 51. 55. 63.

Others

Others however tell us, that if the Britiſh miniſter were to aſk them what farther trade could be opened? what new manufactures promoted? their anſwer would be, 'You can give us nothing, and our only requeſt on 'the part of Ireland is, that you will let us alone *.'

Both theſe grounds are taken by different perſons in arguing againſt a Union, and for the purpoſe of proving that Ireland either ought to obtain, or, if ſhe has already obtained, ought for ever to be permitted to poſſeſs every poſſible benefit of trade ſhe can derive from this kingdom, without our propoſing that ſhe ſhould agree to that meaſure; that is, agree to a ſettlement which, while it would afford the only permanent ſecurity for thoſe benefits, would, in my opinion, at the ſame time confer others of a ſtill more important nature than any commercial advantage whatever, both on that country and on this.

With that opinion, I do not ſcruple to ſay, in regard to ſuch commercial boons as may ſtill be left in the power of Great Britain, that I would not be haſty to part with them if there were any chance that a belief that they can only be acquired through a Union might work in its favour on the ſelfiſh tempers of thoſe who overlook the many more weighty political reaſons for its adoption.

As to the advantages which have already been granted, though it may be true that, in contributing to the proſperity of Ireland, they alſo promote that of the whole empire, of which ſhe forms ſo material a part; what if the machinations of foreign and domeſtic enemies,—the ſuggeſtions of ill-directed national vanity,—the exaggerated

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 77.

and miſtaken principle of independence,—and the reſtleſs and proſelytical ſpirit of democracy, ſhould ſucceed in tearing aſunder this mighty limb from the imperial body; would it, in ſuch caſe, be ſtill for the intereſt of Great Britain to continue the laws by which thoſe advantages have been beſtowed?

Sir, I do not like to purſue this train of reflection; but I am ſatisfied, for many reaſons which I think muſt occur to all who hear me, and of which ſome have been lately ſtated in another place with irreſiſtible ſtrength and perſpicuity of argument, that thoſe cauſes are at this moment operating, ſome of them open and avowed, others more ſilent, and ſcarcely perceptible to the very perſons actuated by them, but all with ſuch increaſing energy, that if a Union does not ſoon take plaee, a ſeparation unfortunate to Great Britain and ruinous to Ireland certainly will.

I have already mentioned my perſuaſion, that the people of Ireland will in time, after a really final ſettlement of the connexion and relations between the two countries by an incorporating Union, experience the advantages of a communication of Engliſh capital and credit. This poſition, when ſtated by much more weighty authority, has been treated, I find, as 'a fooliſh, abſurd, futile, and 'unſupported aſſertion*.' How this ſelection of epithets ſhould have been ſo made and applied by a perſon of known judgment, good temper, and urbanity, it is not my buſineſs to inquire; but I think the aſſertion, which by the by, as it related to what may be expected to happen, was an aſſertion only of opinion and belief, may be

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 68. 76.

conſidered

conſidered as approaching as nearly to a prediction of the truth as any thing can do, which mere human foreſight may conjecture and pronounce concerning future conſequences and events. Is much argument neceſſary to convince us that monied men will be more ready than at preſent to lend their capital on landed ſecurity, or to pledge their credit by partnerſhips in trade and manufactures in that country, after it ſhall poſſeſs a ſteady uniformity of government,—the ſame legiſlature with themſelves,—an eſtabliſhed conformity of legal deciſions to thoſe whereby their property is regulated and ſecured at home,—internal peace and habitual induſtry?

But a detail is gone into to ſhow that Engliſh money is not likely to be tranſported to Ireland and veſted there, either in trade or manufactures.

If I underſtand the general ſcope of that detail, and if I do not, it muſt be owing to the little familiarity I have with ſuch ſubjects, it is this: 1ſt, A Union will not carry over Engliſh capital to be employed in the manufactory in Ireland of any of the great articles of conſumption with which we now ſupply that country, viz. woollens, cotton goods, iron, and pottery, becauſe England has advantages for thoſe fabrics not to be found in Ireland, and which will always render them ſo much cheaper in the former country, that the Iriſh conſumer will rather import them from thence, than buy them as made at home. 2d, Neither will a Union induce the Engliſh capitaliſt to eſtabliſh ſuch manufactures in Ireland for exportation to foreign markets, becauſe thoſe foreign markets have been long as open to Ireland as they can be after a Union, and yet no ſuch eſtabliſhments have taken place. 3d, As it will not carry over Engliſh

capital to eſtabliſh, either for Iriſh conſumption or foreign export, thoſe manufactures in which Britain excels Ireland; neither will it attract it to that manufacture in which Ireland underſells Great Britain, namely, the linen; 'for though that manufactory has been free and 'proſperous in Ireland for theſe ninety years, and has 'afforded many great fortunes to the induſtrious who 'have engaged in it, yet hardly any Britiſh capital has 'ſettled in it*.'

Permit me, Sir, to examine ſhortly how theſe different points are made out.

'Iron and pottery,' it is ſaid, 'depend ſo totally on 'plenty and cheapneſs of fuel, that they exiſt only in the 'coal countries, and have never been known, even in 'England, to make what can be called a ſettlement at 'any diſtance from a plentiful colliery. In the pottery 'too, the flint and clay which are ſo abundant in England, have not yet been found in any quantity in Ireland, and in fact there is not a ſingle pottery in Ireland. 'It is ſelf-evident, therefore, that theſe manufactures 'never can travel from the country which has coal, to 'that which has it not—from Britain to Ireland;—and 'the ſame facility of fuel muſt give to Britain a decided 'preference in all manufactures where ſteam engines 'cheapen the price of labour. Woollens, though eſtabliſhed for centuries in Yorkſhire, have never travelled 'in any direction ten miles from the coal country, and 'they are manufactured there to ſuch advantage over Ireland, that England ſupplies her to the value of near '600,000*l.* a year, though burdened with an import duty

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 75.

'of

'of more than 8 per cent. And as to cottons, machinery 'being more uſed in this manufactory than in the others, 'the Iriſh cannot, even on the eaſtern coaſt oppoſite the 'Britiſh collieries, make cotton twiſt within at leaſt 20 'per cent. as cheap as Britain can ſupply them. In 'Britain, during the continuance of *Arkwright*'s patent, 'this fabric was ſubject to a heavy charge on that ac-'count; but though ſuch excluſive privilege did not exiſt 'in Ireland, no Engliſh money was ever employed to fit 'up his machinery there *.'

You will perceive how much ſtreſs is laid in this enumeration of difficulties on the circumſtance of fuel. But let us not take it for granted, either that cheapneſs of fuel is ſo indiſpenſable a requiſite to cheapneſs of manufacture, even in the inſtances in queſtion, as that it may not be compenſated for by other circumſtances; or that abundance of coal is a benefit which nature has ſo abſolutely denied to Ireland as ſeems in this part of the argument to have been aſſumed.

Take the caſe of iron: I am informed that ſome of the articles made of that metal which require the greateſt conſumption of coals, for example anchors, are manufactured in this metropolis, where fuel is, I believe, dearer than in almoſt any other part of the kingdom. Labour is alſo dearer here than in moſt of the other ſea-port towns, to which thoſe anchors are to be ſent. Yet other circumſtances having occaſioned the employment of the capital, and the cultivation of the ſkill neceſſary for that buſineſs in this place, it ſeems that it can be carried on, on the whole, to more advantage here than where both coals

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 68, 69, 70. 72, 73.

and labour are much cheaper. The importance of the cheapneſs of fuel to the manufacturing of other commodities made of iron, is much over-rated; it is certainly a very material circumſtance in regard to coarſer articles; but it will be found, by conſulting the proper documents, that four-fifths of the goods made of iron, which are annually exported from Great Britain to Ireland and other parts of the world, conſiſt of goods in the manufacture of which the price of coals has hardly any perceptible effect: the principal value of thoſe goods is derived from the ſkill and labour of the artiſan; but labour is alſo dearer in the places where they are made, chiefly Birmingham and Sheffield, than in moſt parts of the world. The only advantage therefore Great Britain poſſeſſes as to ſuch articles ariſes from the ſuperior ſkill, expertneſs, and celerity of the workman. But with the encouragement which a new ſtate of things would hold out to the Iriſh manufacturers, is it to be doubted that they will attain to an equality in thoſe reſpects with thoſe of this country*?

The ſtatement as to the woollen goods made in Great Britain, would lead an inattentive perſon to ſuppoſe that this manufacture was almoſt entirely confined to York-

* I am informed that the city of Liege affords a ſtriking example of the ſmall relative importance of cheapneſs of fuel and labour, to the ſucceſs of the moſt valuable manufactures in iron. That city had been for many ages noted for thoſe manufactures; coals may be dug almoſt at the very gates of the town, and at a very trifling expenſe, as the veins are to be found within a few feet of the ſurface, and there is hardly any part of the continent where proviſions are cheaper and more abundant; yet Birmingham and Sheffield now underſell Liege in thoſe very manufactures for which ſhe had been long ſo famous, with the exception of a very few articles, at the rate of not leſs than from 15 to 25 per cent.

ſhire.

ſhire. That county, or rather a circuit within that county of not more than ten miles every way, is called its 'old and great ſettlement *.' But the fact is, that the trade there, though certainly very extenſive, is confined chiefly to the coarſer kind of cloths, while the principal ſeat of the manufactory of fine cloths, as well as of the light and fancy woollen goods, is in a part of England where coals are much dearer than in a great many parts of Ireland, namely, at Bradford, Trowbridge, and Chippenham.

The real caſe as to the Iriſh woollen trade is, that Ireland works up all the wool ſhe produces, though ſhe now only exports to the value of about 12,500*l.* yearly, inſtead of 110,207*l.* her export of that article a century ago, and ſhe receives from this country to the annual amount of 580,723*l.* This is no longer owing to the reſtrictive condition of a compact long ago at an end; nor does it appear that the goods of this material which ſhe does make, are dearer or neceſſarily ſo than thoſe ſhe imports from hence, the quality of each being conſidered;—we are told the true reaſon; it is, 'that agriculture and the 'linen manufacture are found to give better profit in land 'than ſheep afforded †;' a reaſon which, no doubt, as to that manufacture will continue to operate, whatever may become of the preſent duties upon it in its tranſit either from Ireland to this country, or from hence to Ireland.

In the cotton buſineſs I underſtand the conſumption of coals is, comparatively ſpeaking, very inconſiderable. Fuel is not more abundant now in England than it was

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 69. † Ibid. p. 72.

five-

five-and-twenty years ago; yet during that period the quantity of cotton wool manufactured in Great Britain has increaſed from three to near thirty millions of pounds. The importation of the raw material is alike open to Ireland: that country abounds in weavers; and I am told the workman who is in the practice of weaving linen is capable, with little or no previous inſtruction or practice, of becoming an expert weaver of plain cottons. What then is the real cauſe of her paying to this country more than 100,000*l.* a year for cotton goods manufactured here? what but the want of that capital which alone excites the induſtry and attention, and thereby improves the ſkill of the workman, furniſhes the means of dividing labour, which diminiſhes its coſt beyond any difference, a difference in the amount of wages and expenſe of living can ever occaſion, and enables the opulent trader to give long credit, ſupport accidental loſſes, and thrive under a much ſmaller profit than is requiſite to others leſs fortunate in that reſpect, who might attempt to become his rivals.

But, does Great Britain poſſeſs ſuch advantages over Ireland in reſpect of fuel as has been ſuppoſed?

Many coal-mines exiſt and are worked in Ireland*, and I believe in many parts of it the veins are rich and extenſive. Mr. *Evans*, engineer to the Grand Canal, in his evidence laid before the Iriſh Houſe of Commons in 1783, as quoted two years afterwards at the bar of this Houſe, ſaid, 'That the Kilkenny collieries, if properly 'worked, were capable of producing 300,000 tons of 'culm yearly; that this might be carried by the canal,

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 88. Beaufort's Memoir, p. 27.

'and

'and ſold at the diſtance of forty miles for 1*s.* 6*d.* per 'barrel of 4 cwt.; that there were collieries at Lough 'Allen equal in quantity, if properly worked, to the 'ſupply of the whole kingdom, and in quality equal, if 'not ſuperior, to the beſt Whitehaven coals*.' There are ſeams of coal at Drumglaſs and Dungannon†, ſaid to be of ſuch thickneſs and goodneſs as to be more than equal to ſix times the conſumption of Dublin; and thoſe collieries are within a few miles of a canal by which a water communication is already open to that city and every other part of Ireland. What has been the real cauſe that thoſe mines have not hitherto been turned to account? Not the want of encouragement from the Iriſh Parliament; they have been always ready and liberal in furniſhing public aid to works promiſing to prove of public benefit. But experience has long ſhown that public money, even to profuſion, will not perform the functions of private capital, the utter deficiency of which appears to have occaſioned the failure of every undertaking hitherto formed for completing the works neceſſary to furniſh the metropolis and country of Ireland with this valuable commodity from her own mines.

After all, while coals brought coaſtwiſe from one part of England to another, excluſive of London, are ſubject to a duty of ſomewhat more than 5*s.* 9*d.* per chaldron, and if to London, of no leſs than 9*s.* 5*d.*, when exported to Ireland they pay but 1*s.* 9*d.* in Great Britain, and, if for the uſe of the manufactories, no Iriſh duty; and an inexhauſtible ſupply from Wales, Whitehaven, and the weſt of Scotland, is open to the whole extent of the

* Minutes of Evidence, 2d May 1783.

† *Young*'s Tour, vol. ii. p. 91.

eaſtern ſhores of Ireland; and from the ſhortneſs of the run and other circumſtances, beſides the inferiority of duty, the expenſe of freight and other charges is really conſiderably leſs between thoſe parts of Great Britain and Ireland, than to the places in England where the manufacturer is obliged to have his fuel by water-carriage.

In regard to the flint and clay uſed in the pottery wares, if faith is to be given to the teſtimony of a perſon who knew that buſineſs very thoroughly, it will appear that England is far from poſſeſſing ſuch great natural advantages over Ireland as has been ſuppoſed. The late Mr. *Wedgwood*, on his examination before this and the other Houſe of Parliament when the Iriſh Propoſitions were depending, ſtated, that ſome of the flints uſed in this manufacture are brought from the Iriſh ſhore, being picked up from the ballaſt of Iriſh veſſels diſcharged at Liverpool; and that the finer clay is procured on the coaſt of England, and can be ſhipped at 6 or 7*s.* per ton, but that from the additional charge of the inland carriage, it coſts when it reaches Staffordſhire from 1*l.* 16*s.* to 2*l.* 2*s.* His concluſion was, that if the Propoſitions had been adopted, Ireland might have underſold Great Britain in pottery goods 40 or 50 per cent.*

To ſhow that Britiſh capital will not, in conſequence of a legiſlative Union, be veſted, or Britiſh credit pledged, either in the eſtabliſhment of new Iriſh manufactures for foreign markets, or in the farther cultivation and extenſion of the exiſting linen trade of that country, the reaſoning

* Minutes of Evidence, &c. at the bar of the Houſe of Commons, 2d May 1785, p. 177, 178. At the bar of the Houſe of Lords, 16th June 1785, p. 145. 152. 160, 161.

drawn

drawn from the experience of what has happened while there was no ſuch Union, proceeds on a direct *petitio principii*, on the aſſumption that ſuch Union will neither furniſh invitations which cannot be expected, nor remove obſtacles which cannot be done away, by any other means. Indeed the great ſtaple commodity of Ireland, her linen, is even now much more indebted to Britiſh credit than from the ſtatements I have referred to would be ſuppoſed. It may be true that, in a ſtrict ſenſe, Britiſh capital has not '*ſettled*' (to any extent) in Ireland, that is, that perſons from this kingdom have not removed with large capitals to reſide in that country for the purpoſe of carrying on a traffic in Iriſh linens. But is it a correct inference from thence, that Britiſh money has had no influence in promoting the fabric of thoſe linens? I have the very beſt reaſon to believe that in general the linen manufacturers and merchants in Ireland, in order to be able to carry on their buſineſs, find it neceſſary to draw on the agent or factor here to whom their conſignments are made, immediately after the goods are ſhipped, for about two-thirds of the amount of their value, although a very conſiderable part of thoſe goods often remains on the hands of ſuch conſignee for ſix or nine months, and he is afterwards frequently obliged to continue ſtill longer out of his money by the credit he is expected to give to the purchaſers.

Sir, the ſecurity and advancement of trade and manufactures are unqueſtionably matters of great national concern, but I can never look upon them as the chief, much leſs as the excluſive objects of Government. I am ſatisfied Ireland would gain by a Union with Great

Britain advantages much more important*; general civilization; ſettled habits of morality and true religion, in the room of the blind ſuperſtition and fanatical rage, now too commonly to be found among the different ſects in that country; a uniform ſubmiſſion to law; and that which is eſſential to the attainment of thoſe great ends, the mitigation and gradual extinction of the ſpirit of diſturbance, inſurrection, devaſtation, plunder and maſſacre, which has prevailed among the Iriſh peaſantry with more or leſs violence, but almoſt without intermiſſion, as far back as we can trace their authentic hiſtory, though under various pretexts, and with various diſtinctions and appellations, ſerving at different periods as the watch-words for every ſpecies of bloody and barbarous hoſtility. It would be a uſeleſs, tedious, and diſguſting taſk to enter into the particulars of this ſort, with which the annals of Ireland are filled, eſpecially ſince the period when the unfortunate adherence of the majority of the people to the errors of the Romiſh church eſtabliſhed the great diviſion of her inhabitants into Proteſtants and Papiſts.

I own I have been often aſtoniſhed to find men of ſenſe and information imputing this melancholy condition of ſociety in Ireland, to this or the other meaſure or ſyſtem of this or the other miniſtry of the preſent reign; a reign too which has been diſtinguiſhed by a continued ſeries of acts of lenity and beneficence to that country. But I was particularly ſurpriſed, upon a late occaſion, to hear all the miſeries and diſcord we have lately witneſſed, all the bloodſhed which has deluged our ſiſter kingdom, charged to the recall of a reſpectable and ami-

* *Smith*'s Wealth of Nations, vol. iii. p. 460.

able

able Nobleman from the Lord Lieutenancy in the ſpring of 1795. Is it then believed that all would have been well if Lord *Fitzwilliam* had been left to govern Ireland, on the principles which he had been adviſed, or was reſolved to adopt? Is it thought that the diſciples of *Tone*, whoſe political goſpel was framed and promulgated years before the appointment of that Chief Governor, would have been ſatisfied with his intended grant of Catholic emancipation, and his intended refuſal of Parliamentary reform? Sir, we have demonſtrative proof that the conceſſion of both would not have ſatisfied them. That preacher of revolution and his diſciples were to be ſatisfied with nothing that his Majeſty's Government, or his Parliament, could give; they were to be ſatisfied only by the eſtabliſhment of a democratic republic with a Gallo-Hibernian Directory; while the imaginations of their mad and deluded followers were inflamed—not with conſiderations of religion or legiſlature—of this or that ſet of dogmas—or this or that form and right of election—but with a rage for the invaſion of property; the abolition of tithes and even rent, on the true French plan, without compenſation or equivalent; the extinction of all law, civil and criminal!

Others admit that the misfortunes of Ireland are not ſolely imputable to the recall of Lord *Camden*'s predeceſſor, or to what I believe they modeſtly and charitably denominate the weak and wicked policy of his Majeſty's preſent Miniſters. They are willing to allow that former adminiſtrations, for a long courſe of years, are entitled to their ſhare in the blame. In truth, Sir, if the ſervants of the Crown, at different periods, were anſwerable for thoſe inveterate and ever recurring diſorders of that country which have prevailed during their reſpective adminiſtrations,

miniſtrations, not one could be exculpated of all thoſe who have at any time had a ſhare in the government of the empire, from the days of *Burleigh*, *Bacon*, and *Walſingham*, down to thoſe of their preſent ſucceſſors in the reſponſible departments of the ſtate; neither Lord *Strafford*, a name not free perhaps from juſt reproach, but illuſtrious alſo for talents and virtues to which his deſcendant the Noble Earl I have mentioned muſt look back with ſatisfaction and pride, nor Lord *Clarendon*, the Dukes of *Ormond*, Lord *Somers*, Lord *Cowper*, Sir *Robert Walpole*, Mr. *Pelham*, &c. &c. any more than thoſe whom we ourſelves have known at different times entruſted by his preſent Majeſty with the conduct of public affairs. But do Gentlemen ſeriouſly believe that all the ſucceſſive meaſures of ſo many great, enlightened, and liberal ſtateſmen have been inſpired by blind ignorance, tyrannical oppreſſion, or infatuated folly? Sir, I cannot agree in ſuch a lampoon, both on the memory of ſo many great men whom I have learned to reverence and admire, and on the general principles and practice of the Engliſh government for more than two centuries. I believe every thing which wiſe and impartial policy could ſuggeſt has, at different times, been tried, and, alas! tried in vain, during that long period; though it cannot be denied that occaſions have alſo intervened, where paſſion, prejudice, and ſhort-ſighted maxims of government have prevailed. But on the whole, the unavoidable concluſion is this—to adopt the words of one of the learned barriſters to whom I referred in an early part of what I have ſubmitted to the Houſe, as I have ſeen them reported—'There is 'ſome radical error in *the ſyſtem* of Iriſh government, 'and this ſhould be ſought for and corrected, elſe the 'ſeeds of diſcontent will fructify for ever.' The gentleman

tleman indeed ſeems to have meant a radical error, not in *the frame and conſtitution*, but in *the adminiſtration* of the Iriſh Government. That opinion I have, I think, clearly refuted. To what remaining ſource then are we to trace this fundamental defect, whoſe exiſtence is ſo manifeſt? To what other can it be traced, but to the imperfections incident to a local and diſtinct Parliament, in a country forming but part, and the leaſt powerful part, of an extenſive empire; to that Parliament which, though often, and now I believe particularly, containing in it men of as much talents and integrity as can exiſt any where, has yet, after the experience of ages, been found inadequate to provide an effectual remedy for the hitherto incurable maladies of the country?

Permit me, Sir, here to advert to certain arguments I have lately met with, to prove that it cannot be expected that an incorporated Legiſlature, aſſembled at Weſtminſter, ſhould be able to tranquillize Ireland, or gradually eſtabliſh civilization and a peaceable ſubmiſſion to the authority of the laws among the lower orders of its inhabitants. Such a Parliament will be unacquainted, it ſeems, with the local circumſtances of a kingdom 'which it never 'ſees,' and will be at too great a diſtance to adminiſter in time to the wants or wiſhes of the people, or to guard againſt exceſſes or diſcontents*. One might ſuppoſe, from this ſtatement, that the Iriſh Parliament is in a continual progreſs through the iſland, or ready to fly at a moment from one end of it to the other, whenever wiſhes are to be gratified, or diſcontents ſuppreſſed. Does the Britiſh Legiſlature, in its aggregate ſtate, ever ſee

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 65.

more of Great Britain than is contained within the walls of this or the other Houſe of Parliament, or is it not the province of the Executive Miniſters of Government, not of the Legiſlature, on ſudden emergencies, to diſpenſe inſtant favours or apply inſtant coercion, if the good of the community ſhall require the one ſort of interpoſition or the other; ſubject, no doubt, to the cenſure of the Legiſlature, if they ſhall unneceſſarily on ſuch occaſions tranſgreſs, but entitled to indemnity if they ſhall appear to have acted wiſely in exceeding, the bounds of their lawful authority.

Since, as has been truly ſaid, 'neither peace nor war '*neceſſarily* require the act of either Legiſlature*,' and the ſupreme Executive Government in London is, by the conſtitution of the empire, entruſted with the care of repelling any ſudden and unexpected invaſion even of Ireland, by a *foreign* enemy, one would imagine the branches of that Executive Government which will continue reſident in Dublin, might be ſuppoſed adequate to whatever immediate meaſures any emergency alike ſudden and unexpected may call for, towards the ſuppreſſion of riots, inſurrection, or rebellion *in* that country.

I am moſt willing and ready to allow extraordinary merit to the energy of the Iriſh Parliament during the late fatal rebellion, which the concurrent exertions of both Legiſlatures, of the Executive Government in both countries, and, above all, of the brave troops of Ireland and Great Britain, under the benign providence of God, have ſo fortunately repreſſed, though, I fear, not totally extinguiſhed; but I ſhould think it an ill compli-

* Mr. *Foſter's* Speech, p. 53.

ment

ment to the Iriſh Parliament and the Iriſh nation, were I to ſuppoſe that the diſtinguiſhed ſhare they have had in the happy change which has been effected, could be in any great degree aſcribed to the impreſſion made by a proceſſion of two hundred Members of that Parliament, with the mace at their head, through the ſtreets of Dublin, from College Green to the Caſtle*.

It ſeems this idea of a reſident Legiſlature is to be carried ſo far as to warrant the ſuppoſition, that if Scotland had had its Parliament ſitting at Edinburgh, the conſpiracy which has been traced to that country, would have been ſooner developed, and more completely cruſhed†. Is it then recommended that the Scotch Union ſhould be diſſolved? Or is the Parliament in London only competent to preſerve tranquillity on the ſouth ſide of the Tweed?

It is aſked, if a reſident Parliament and reſident gentry cannot ſoften the manners, amend the habits, or promote ſocial intercourſe, will *no* Parliament and fewer reſident gentry do it‡? I anſwer this by another queſtion, Has what is called a reſident Parliament done it? It has not: it is not pretended that it has. And as to the United Legiſlature being no Parliament for Ireland, I have endeavoured, and I truſt with ſucceſs, to ſhow, in a former part of what I have ſaid, how extremely ill-founded that propoſition is. With regard to the reſidence of the Iriſh gentry, I ſhall ſubmit a few obſervations by and by. None, in my opinion, are requiſite in anſwer to the remarks concerning the plots which have exiſted in this kingdom, and the pertinacious adherence of the Welſh to their national language, and of the Highlanders to theirs

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 66. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 64.

and their ancient dreſs *. For who can be perſuaded as to thoſe circumſtances (the firſt moſt ſerious indeed, but of a temporary nature, and ariſing from accidental cauſes; the others ſuch as are not to be changed, if ſuch a change is really important, but by the gradual and ſlow operation of increaſing intercourſe), that there is any ſort of compariſon between them and the rooted evils of habitual reſiſtance to all law, and inſurrection againſt all legitimate authority, ſo prevalent in Ireland?

It has been ſaid, Will a legiſlative Union appeaſe Catholic diſcontent, or aſſuage the animoſity of the Proteſtants? I anſwer, I am ſatisfied the *ſeparate* Parliament of Ireland never will, perhaps with ſafety it never can, admit the Catholics to participate in the higher political privileges of the ſtate; and the Catholics will never quietly ſubmit to an *Iriſh* Parliament excluſively Proteſtant, having learned to conſider that excluſive juriſdiction as an oppreſſive tyrannical uſurpation of the few upon the many. Perhaps a *United* Parliament may find it ſafe to admit them; and if their admiſſion were ſafe, their excluſion would thenceforward be unjuſt. I will not now enter into the argument of that grave and momentous queſtion. I have often and long reflected upon it; and, if the occaſion ſhall ever require it, I ſhall be ready freely to deliver my ſentiments in regard to it. I do not think the preſent occaſion calls for its diſcuſſion. I will only obſerve, that it ſeems to be the opinion as well of ſome of thoſe who beſt underſtand the intereſts of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment and are moſt peculiarly bound in duty to guard and maintain them, as of ſome who have come forward in public the earneſt and zealous oppoſers of the Catholic claims ſhould the preſent local

* Mr. *Foſter's* Speech, p. 67.

Parliament

Parliament remain—of the venerable Primate of Ireland, as declared in his ſpeech of the 22d of January laſt, and of Dr. *Duigenan*, as ſtated in his celebrated anſwer to Mr. *Grattan*—that Catholic emancipation, as it is affectedly called, might, in caſe of the legiſlative incorporation of Ireland with this country, be acceded to without danger. The words of Dr. *Duigenan* are remarkable. They ſtruck me much on the firſt appearance of his work, before this meaſure of Union had been ſo generally thought of as it has been ſince; and I then pointed them out to the attention of many of my friends. I believe they have already been referred to in ſome former debates; but as the paſſage is ſhort, I will take the liberty of reading it.

'If we were one people with the Britiſh nation, the 'preponderance of the Proteſtant body of the whole em- 'pire would be ſo great, that all rivalſhip and jealouſies 'between Proteſtants and Romaniſts would ceaſe for 'ever; and it would not be neceſſary, for the ſafety of 'the empire at large, to curb the Romaniſts by any ex- 'cluſive laws whatſoever *.'

If the Catholics ſhould not be admitted into the United Parliament, ſtill they will not then have to complain that they are excluded by a great minority of the nation; nor will they be any longer expoſed to that ſenſe of a mortifying and galling inferiority, which they ſay it is the habit, which I fear it is in the nature, of their local Legiſlature to excite, acted upon and ſtirred up to perpetual exertions of ſevere authority, by the jealouſy and apprehenſions to which the ſtruggles of the Catholics, at their very doors in a manner and under their immediate eye, continually give riſe.

* *Duigenan*'s Anſwer to *Grattan*, p. 79.

We have ſeen the invalidity of the reaſons by which ſome of the ſuppoſed diſadvantages to Ireland likely to ariſe from the aſſembling of the common Legiſlature out of that iſland and at the metropolis of the empire, have been attempted to be proved. Another of thoſe ſuppoſed diſadvantages remains to be noticed. It is ſaid the preſent ſtate of things keeps the purſe of the Iriſh nation in the honeſt hands of an Iriſh Parliament; and that if a number inferior to thoſe choſen by Great Britain ſhall be ſent from Ireland to an United Legiſlature, they will carry this purſe over, and, laying it at the Miniſter's feet, deliver it up to his full power and uncontrolled diſcretion *. The ſtrict economy of the Iriſh Parliament, and its prudent reſiſtance to the calls of the Executive Government for pecuniary ſupplies, however juſt its claim to that praiſe, will not, I believe, be admitted by the majority of thoſe who have oppoſed a Union, either on this or the other ſide of the water. But has any body ever ſuppoſed that York, Briſtol and Liverpool, or Limerick, Cork and Waterford, have run a greater riſk than Weſtminſter and Dublin, in confiding the power of their purſe to Parliaments aſſembled in thoſe laſt-mentioned cities? Suppoſe a partner in a mercantile houſe eſtabliſhed in Cork to come to England on account of the partnerſhip, and with full power to act for it; if ſuch a perſon, during his abſence in this country, ſhould make a draft or accept a bill for the general behalf of the concern, would there be more danger of injury to the houſe from an improvident exerciſe of his power in that reſpect in ſuch caſe, than if he had been deputed with equal authority to ſome other city in Ireland, to Derry or Belfaſt, and had exerciſed it there?

But when ſuch topics as theſe are urged, do not Gentlemen

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 58, 59.

forget

forget that, according to the Reſolutions * propoſed to be carried up to the Throne with this joint addreſs, the rate of taxation between the two kingdoms is to be regulated by fixed rules and principles, to be agreed upon previous to the Union? The purſe of Ireland therefore will, in a peculiar degree, have for its guardians not only the members Ireland ſhall elect, but thoſe alſo choſen by Great Britain, as they can never concur in taxing that country without impoſing a burden on this, in a proportion which Ireland as well as this country, and not in conjunction with it, but while ſtill in its diſtinct and ſeparate ſtate, ſhall have ſanctioned: and hence we have no occaſion, here, to recur to the argument I ſome time ſince ſubmitted to the Houſe in order to ſhow the little ground there is to apprehend, that the general intereſts of Ireland will be overlooked or ſacrificed by a United Legiſlature. In this material inſtance of taxation, the very ſelfiſhneſs of Great Britain herſelf will protect (ſince there are ſtill thoſe who will delight in viewing their intereſts as different) the ſeparate purſe of Ireland.

It ſeems to be chiefly for the purpoſe of meeting this argument that the alarms are raiſed to which I referred at the outſet; leſt the articles of Union ſhould be infringed to the detriment of Ireland, whenever an infraction of them may be thought beneficial to Great Britain. To give colour to theſe apprehenſions, we are told of the diſavowal of the compact of 1782. This, it is ſaid, muſt create a ſuſpicion that any compact made in 1799 may be treated as lightly †. I have ſhown that no compact of the ſort inſiſted on can have been intended in 1782; that whatever was then held out on the part of this country has been ſtrictly adhered to; that the claim of the Britiſh

* Vide 7th Reſolution.

† Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 99.

Parliament

Parliament to legiſlate for Ireland has never been renewed, as I am ſatisfied it never will; but that when there is a compact between two diſtinct countries, if either of them ſhall break its part of it, the other may be able to reſume its former ſituation, whereas in the caſe of an incorporating Union that is impoſſible; and that therefore ſuch a compact can only be broken by lawleſs and revolutionary violence: which if it were attempted with ſucceſs after a Union, would diſſolve the whole political machine, and is no more to be dreaded than any other imaginable and poſſible ſubverſion of the ſtate.

What has been in fact the caſe as to the Scotch Union? No candid man who is verſed in the hiſtory of this country ſince that memorable tranſaction will deny that its ſpirit, in all its clear and important parts, in all its 'fundamental and eſſential conditions *,' has been adhered to ever ſince with ſcrupulous and ſacred inviolability. The contrary, indeed, has been often, and was early attempted to be proved by the violence of faction and to ſerve the purpoſes of the day, though at the riſk of no matter what public miſchief and confuſion. Such, among others, was the attempt in 1713, when, parties running high, the reluctance of the Scotch to ſubmit to a general malt-tax was laid hold of, and their repreſentatives perſuaded, though upon a doubtful conſtruction of one of the ſecondary clauſes of the treaty, and one whoſe effect at beſt was only to be of a temporary and ſhort duration, to raiſe a cry that thoſe articles of the Union which were in favour of Scotland had been infringed; and even to bring forward a motion in Parliament † for its formal diſſolution; a motion which thoſe who had encouraged it were far, I believe, from wiſhing to ſucceed, having done ſo merely

* Article 25.

† 1ſt June 1713. Lords' Debates, vol. ii. p. 394. Continuation of Rapin, vol. xviii. p. 83.

with

with the hope that it would contribute to the overthrow of an adminiſtation to which they expected to ſucceed.

In hunting for objections on the preſent occaſion, the circumſtances of that occurrence have been eagerly looked into, and turned and twiſted in a great variety of ways. But as one of the laſt, and certainly not the leaſt of thoſe who have conceived it to be their duty publicly to oppoſe the propoſal of a Union between Ireland and Great Britain, ſcarcely appears to have thought they could be employed to any uſeful purpoſe on his ſide of the queſtion, I do not deem it neceſſary for me to detain the Houſe by any particular obſervations upon them.

I do not exactly underſtand, after the candid declaration, that the extenſion of the late income-tax is neither a breach of any of the articles of the Scotch Union, nor even ſuſpected to have been meant as an evaſion of it, why it is mentioned as affording an argument to perſuade Ireland not to agree to a ſimilar Union. 'Time and cir-'cumſtances,' it is ſaid, 'have ſet aſide the great beneficial 'difference in taxation which induced Scotland to conſent 'to a Union *.' And we are told, 'that, inſtead of tax-'ing the land, the income ariſing out of the land is taxed, 'and that the effect is therefore the ſame to the Scotch-'man as if the articles of Union were broken †.' Sir, I ſhould like to aſk whether when the tea, the coffee, the wine, the ſugar, &c. a Scotchman purchaſes with the income ariſing from his land is taxed at the ſame rate as thoſe articles are in England, it might not as well be argued that this alters the ſettled proportion of land-tax, and amounts to a virtual breach of the articles of Union?

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p 96. † Ibid.

But

But what part of the hiſtory of that tranſaction proves that a difference in taxation was the ruling motive with Scotland upon that occaſion? The ratio of the tax on land between the two countries was ſettled on particular grounds, in my opinion reaſonable in themſelves, and ſatisfactory to the parties concerned; they may be ſeen ſtated at length in *De Foe*'s book. In regard to the taxation of a particular ſort of beer or ale uſed only in Scotland, a difference was alſo ſtipulated for in favour of that country *, and likewiſe an exemption from certain temporary duties then exiſting in England †, and from any tax to be impoſed on malt during the war ‡. But as to all the other great duties of cuſtoms and exciſe then in force in England, and all duties to be impoſed after the expiration of thoſe temporary taxes, except in the caſe of the ſort of beer I have mentioned, an equality of rates was expreſsly agreed to §, though with this equitable qualification, that, beſides a certain ſum to be paid immediately, a fund ſhould he created equal to ſuch portion of the ſhare of the common revenue which would be raiſed on Scotland, as might be applicable to the then debts of England; to be applied, in the firſt place, to the extinction of the debts of Scotland, and afterwards to objects of local improvement there ‖.

I conceive that Scotland, when ſhe agreed to the Union, looked to far other advantages than a general and ſuppoſed beneficial difference in taxation, a difference ſhe could always inſure without a Union. She looked to advantages which, by increaſing her wealth and general income, would enable her to flouriſh under an equal ratio of contribution,—the points the two parties had agreed on excepted,—to the common exigencies of

* Art. 7. † Art. 8. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.
‡ Art. 14. ſupra, p. 102. § Art. 7, 8. 14, 15.
‖ Art. 15.

the

the United State. Whether ſhe has been diſappointed in that motive for her conduct, and that proſpect to which ſhe looked forward, I will now proceed to inquire.

Indeed, that Scotland has thriven through the whole courſe of the preſent century to an extraordinary degree, in all the branches of national wealth and improvement, is a fact notorious to all who have attended to the progreſs of that part of the kingdom, but particularly to ſuch as are beſt acquainted with, or moſt intereſted in her concerns. The truth of the fact therefore does not ſeem to be controverted; but it is ſaid 'the argument is ſhallow 'which attributes every increaſe of trade, of population, 'of wealth in Scotland from that day to this, to the 'Union, as if nothing was due to the progreſſive ſtate 'of the world during a century, and Scotland alone, 'amidſt ſurrounding nations, was to have remained 'ſtationary;' and it is added, 'if ſuch was the viciouſ-'neſs of her conſtitution, the miſeries of her ſituation, 'or the depreſſion of her reſources, well might ſhe have 'accepted any terms*.' I do not believe it was ever the intention of any body to aſcribe all the improvements of Scotland excluſively to the Union. The general cauſes alluded to have no doubt operated there, but one might aſk in this place, why thoſe cauſes are ſuppoſed to have been of ſuch powerful agency in Scotland ſince 1707, but of none in Ireland before and ſince 1782.

It is often difficult to aſcertain with exact preciſion the ſpecific cauſes of national proſperity, and to aſſign to each its true ſhare in the general effect. If the Union put Scotland in a ſecure ſituation of participating in the influ-

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 104.

ence of events and circumſtances which were deſtined to meliorate in a greater or leſs degree all the parts of the Britiſh dominions, much was gained by that country, and thus far I think I have already proved. I have referred to the known oppreſſion exerciſed towards her by her more powerful neighbour while they had ſeparate Parliaments, the continuance or renewal of which was, by the Union, effectually prevented. I have moreover ſhown that what England then practiſed againſt Scotland, though to her own detriment, and England and Great Britain long afterwards are accuſed of having practiſed againſt Ireland, may be again practiſed againſt her by a ſeparate government remaining in this country. This is no threat; none now living will ever be ſo unwiſe or ſo unjuſt as to attempt it. But can they entail their wiſdom or their juſtice on ſucceeding ages and their yet unborn ſucceſſors in influence or power?

Arguments and facts, however, ſatisfactory and numerous, might eaſily be adduced to ſhow that the Union has not merely proved of this negative advantage to Scotland, but has been in a great degree the direct cauſe of her increaſed proſperity. On this head the Houſe cannot have forgot the powerful and convincing ſtatements made on a former day by a Right Hon. Gentleman peculiarly ſkilled in the hiſtory and ſituation of that country. I ſhall therefore content myſelf with adding only a very few circumſtances to what was detailed upon that occaſion.

If I can make it probable that the trade of Scotland has increaſed ſince the year 1707, in a greater ratio than that of England, I think I ſhall have a right to con-

clude that this exceſs in the improvement of the former country has been owing to the Union. That tranſaction was not likely to benefit England in the ſame proportion; other general cauſes of melioration would probably do ſo to a greater extent, from her ſuperior advantages of climate, ſituation, and capital.

The facts I have to ſtate are theſe: The Scotch duties of exciſe at the time of the Union amounted only to 30,000*l.* thoſe of cuſtoms to 35,000*l.*—or, together, to 65,000*l.* At that time the cuſtoms of England were 1,341,559*l.* the exciſe 947,602*l.*—together, 2,289,161*l.** According to the account annexed to the 23d Report of the late Committee of Finance, it appears that the groſs total receipt from the cuſtoms of Scotland in the year 1797 was 403,536*l.*, from the exciſe of that country 958,173*l.* Thoſe two ſums added together make 1,361,709*l.* In England the groſs amount received in the ſame year from the cuſtoms was 6,124,346*l.*, that from the exciſe 11,080,044*l.*—together 17,204,390*l.* Now, Sir, that ſum, large as it is, falls extremely ſhort indeed of what it ſhould have been if the advance in its amount had been in the ſame proportion as that which appears to have taken place in regard to the cuſtoms and exciſe in Scotland; for it will be found that by that ratio the amount for England would have been very near forty-eight millions†.

It may indeed with truth be ſaid, that the rate of thoſe duties was very conſiderably lower in Scotland than in England at the time of the Union; but, although by

* *De Foe*, p. 123. Treaty of Union, Art. xv. ſt. 5 Ann. c. 8.

† 65,000 : 2,289,161 : : 1,361,709 : 47,956,479$\frac{1149}{650000}$*l.*

the ſtipulations of that treaty they were (with the exceptions I have mentioned) to become the ſame after it in both countries, yet Parliament, authorized ſo to do under the 14th article of the Treaty, has in truth ſo greatly favoured Scotland ſince in reſpect of two of the main objects of exciſe revenue, malt and diſtilled ſpirits, that the firſt in that country does not now, and did not in the year 1797, pay more than one-half, and the other not two-thirds of the Engliſh duties *. It is alſo to be obſerved, that a heavy duty on many articles conſumed in Scotland, ſuch as tea, ſugar, coffee, &c. &c. and which is therefore in truth paid by that country, is now collected in England.

But if another mode of compariſon ſhould be preferred, we may find the materials for it in *De Foe*. That writer informs us † that it had been eſtimated that the cuſtoms and exciſe of Scotland, if put on the ſame foot with thoſe taxes in England at the time of the Union, would have produced,—cuſtoms 70,000*l.*—exciſe 40,000*l.*—in all 110,000*l.* Now, even this ſum will be found to be, to the produce of thoſe duties in England at that time, not as the preſent produce in Scotland is to that in England, but as it is to a ſum exceeding that by much more than one-half, viz. 28,337,919*l.* ‡

Upon the whole, therefore, I think it is impoſſible not to ſee that the produce of thoſe two great branches

* The duty on ſalt uſed in Scotland is now but in the proportion of 4 to 10 to that in England, ſt. 38 Geo. III. c. 89. The poſt-office duty is alſo much lower in Scotland, 39 Geo. III. c. 77.

† P. 188.

‡ 110,000 : 2,289,161 : : 1,361,709 : 28,337,919 $\frac{46149}{110000}$*l.*

of

of revenue, which may be taken as tolerably exact meaſures of the trade, both foreign and internal, of each country, has, even upon the ſuppoſition of an equality of rates, increaſed in a much greater proportion in Scotland than in England.

But we are aſked, 'Has Scotland advanced in pro-'ſperity ſince the Union as much as Ireland*?' Any one who had given entire credit to the frequent complaints of tyrannical oppreſſion exerciſed by this country almoſt conſtantly towards Ireland, might be apt to conceive, that whatever ſhould make it probable that the improvement of Scotland had done much more than keep pace with that of England during that period, muſt tend, *à fortiori*, to ſhow that it muſt have greatly ſurpaſſed that of Ireland. But knowing how often thoſe complaints have been made from party conſiderations, or dictated by ſpleen and ill humour, I do not think we ought to content ourſelves with ſuch a general preſumption.

No ſingle branch of trade or manufacture, common to the two countries, can afford a ſatisfactory criterion by which to decide the queſtion. Their linen trade has been compared, and calculations have been ſtated to ſhow that Ireland has outrun Scotland very much in that branch. But linen, though a great, is far from the only conſiderable manufacture of Scotland. It is admitted to be the only one of any moment in Ireland. Perhaps a compariſon of the annual revenue of each will furniſh a better teſt.

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 104.

I think

I think it will not be denied, that, to meet the extraordinary expenſes of the times, the taxes in Ireland have been ſtrained of late to nearly as high a pitch as is conſiſtent with the eaſe, comfort, or induſtry of its inhabitants; at leaſt, whoever is acquainted with the two countries will allow, to judge from general appearances in each, that the people of Scotland are as little overpowered by the preſſure of their ſhare of the public burdens of this kingdom, as thoſe of Ireland are by the taxes levied on them. If I may take this for granted, it will follow, without going into the different rates of duties impoſed on the different objects of taxation in each*, that, of the two, that country which, in proportion to its population and natural advantages, yields the greateſt annual amount of public income muſt be in the moſt proſperous ſituation.

Now how does the caſe ſtand? Scotland is acknowledged to contain many fewer inhabitants than Ireland, though in extent the firſt ſomewhat exceeds the latter country; the ſoil of Scotland is much the leaſt fertile; its climate is not ſo temperate as that of Ireland; and its ports and other natural advantages for foreign trade, one great ſource of revenue, are much inferior.

* The duty on diſtilled ſpirits in 1797, was much higher in Ireland than in Scotland, and is ſo ſtill. That on malt in Scotland is now but $7\frac{1}{4}d.\ \frac{10}{18}$ per Wincheſter buſhel, or 5*s.* 3*d.* per quarter; in Ireland it is 6*s.* 6*d.* Ir. or 6*s.* Br. per barrel, A barrel Ir. is about 5 buſhels, a quarter 8 buſhels. The duty in England is but 10*s.* 6*d.* per quarter. The rates of the poſtage of letters in Ireland and Scotland in 1797, were nearly the ſame, and, I believe, continue to be ſo.

Yet,

Yet, with ſo many differences in favour of Ireland, it will be found that the groſs revenue levied in Scotland in the year before laſt, which is the lateſt period of which I have been able to get a full account for both countries, came within conſiderably leſs than 100,000*l.* of that of Ireland. The latter amounted to 1,965,130*l.* Ir. equal to 1,813,966*l.* Br.* ; the former to 1,734,472*l.* leaving a difference only of 79,494*l.* According to the many advantages I have juſt ſtated as belonging to Ireland, if the two countries were in an equal degree of proſperity, the revenue of Ireland ought to have exceeded that of Scotland in an infinitely greater proportion.

I have ſpoken of *groſs* revenue; but the expenſe of collection is ſo much leſs in Scotland than in Ireland (probably alſo an effect of the Union), that on the compariſon of the *net* produce of each, the balance turns very conſiderably in favour of Scotland; for, in the ſame year, the net produce of the Scotch revenue was 1,487,036*l.*; that of Ireland only 1,437,516*l.* Ir. or 1,326,937*l.* † Br. Here the difference is no leſs than 160,099*l.* in favour of Scotland, being the ſum which that country contributed more than Ireland, in that year, to the general aggregate expenditure of the empire, conſidered as a whole.

The ſtatements as to Scotland I have extracted from the accurate reports of the Finance Committee. Thoſe reſpecting Ireland come from a ſource which I can rely upon as perfectly authentic.

* 13*l.* Ir. make 12*l.* Br. and 13 : 12 : : 1,965,130 : 1,813,966$\frac{2}{13}$*l.*

† 13 : 12 : : 1,437,516 : 1,326,937$\frac{11}{13}$*l.*

It

It is ſaid, the trade of Glaſgow, the chief commercial city of Scotland, has decreaſed ſince the American war*. If this were correct, I do not ſee what inference could be drawn from it in regard to the effect of the Union. But I have extremely good authority for ſtating, that although the merchants of that city have loſt the Virginia trade in conſequence of the American revolution, their commerce and navigation are on the whole very conſiderably augmented. They have now, particularly, a very extenſive traffic with the Weſt Indies, of which they had none formerly; and, as to their manufactures, that of cotton is immenſe, and the reſt are in general at leaſt quadrupled within the laſt twenty years.

But has the population of Scotland kept pace in due proportion with that of Ireland†? Sir, the population of Ireland is, as I have ſaid, undoubtedly conſiderably greater, in proportion to its extent, than that of Scotland; but if the much ſmaller number of inhabitants of the latter poſſeſs as much or more uſeful wealth, that is, if they can with equal eaſe to themſelves, which I have endeavoured to render probable, contribute as much or more towards the exigencies of the public as thoſe of the former, it is very difficult to ſee how Ireland can be conſidered as in a ſtate of more rapid progreſſion in point of riches and individual or national proſperity than Scotland.

I cannot help ſuſpecting, however, that there are ſome great miſtakes on the ſubject of the population of theſe kingdoms, and the progreſſive increaſe of numbers in each during the preſent century; that the numbers in

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 105. † Ibid.

Ireland

Ireland have of late been greatly exaggerated, or thoſe in Scotland (and indeed in England) much under-rated.

It is ſaid, the population of Scotland at the Union was a million, and that it is now but a million and a half; whereas Ireland, whoſe inhabitants then were little more than a million and a half, has now a population of near four millions and a half*. I do not know from whence theſe numbers, or at leaſt ſome of them, may have been taken; but ſtatements might have been found, according to which the compariſon would have turned out ſtill more to the advantage of the argument for the ſake of which it has been made.

According to *De Foe*, the number of inhabitants in Scotland at the time of the Union was, inſtead of one, eſteemed to be two millions†; and moſt of the modern calculations have reduced them in our time to the number ſtated, of about a million and a half ‡, ſome conſiderably under §. On the other hand, all the authorities I have happened to meet with for raiſing the population of Ireland ſo high as four millions and a half, according to what I have juſt now mentioned, except that moſt reſpectable one to which I then meant to refer, are to be found in publications which furniſh others of equal weight for taking it ſtill higher, namely, at five millions ‖.

But,

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 105. † Ibid. p. 165.

‡ *Chalmers*'s Eſtimate, p. 224, note; Sir *J. Sinclair*'s Statiſtical Account of Scotland, vol. xx. p. 621.

§ Dr. *Webſter*'s Tables. Dr. *Webſter*, in 1755, made them only 1,265,380; Sir *J. Sinclair*, in 1798, 1,526,492.

‖ Four millions and a half, Meſſrs *Hamilton Rowan* and *Tone*: *Jackſon*'s Trial, p. 80: Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe of Commons of Ireland, 1798, Appendix No. xxii. p. 195:

But, Sir, is it conceivable that Scotland, having in the laſt hundred years improved ſo much in trade, manufactures, and agriculture, having been viſited by no violent epidemical diſtempers, and certainly not having on the whole ſuffered more, notwithſtanding the two ſhort rebellions in 1715 and 1745, than Ireland from internal diſturbances, ſhould have experienced either a diminution of one fourth or more, or even but an increaſe of one third of her population, while that of Ireland has been multiplied four or five fold *?

It is true, more authentic calculations do not carry the population of the latter ſo high. Dr. *Price*, in 1773, reckoned it only 1,908,207, and he then computed that of Scotland at one million and a half †. Lord *Auckland*, in his Letters to Lord *Carliſle* in 1779, ſays, 'the common 'large calculation' of the numbers in Ireland was at that time two millions ‡. Lord *North*, in the debate on the Iriſh Propoſitions in 1785, ſtated them at 2,300,000 ¶.

Mr. *Keogh*'s Authentic Statement of the Proceedings of the Roman Catholics of Dublin, 9th April 1795, p. 37. Five millions, Mr. *Lewins*, ibid. p. 31. Mr. *Emmett*; Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe of Lords of Ireland, 1798, Appendix, No vi. p. 33.

* I think I could ſtate, from a compariſon of the reſpective rates and produce of the duties on diſtilled ſpirits in Scotland and Ireland, very ſtrong preſumptive reaſons for believing that the quantity conſumed is as great in the former as in the latter. If we ſuppoſe the individual uſe of whiſkey in each to be nearly the ſame, this would lead to a very different proportion in the reſpective population of each, from that furniſhed by the common calculations.

† *Price* on Reverſionary Payments, p. 185, note.

‡ P. 82.

¶ 30th May 1785. Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. xviii. p. 425.

and

and he does not appear to have been contradicted. Indeed in the ſame debate, a Gentleman who is a native of that country, admitted them to be under two millions and a half*. So late as 1792, Mr. *Burke*, throughout his Letter to Sir *Hercules Langriſhe*, takes them at three millions†. In that year, however, the ſubject having been much attended to in Ireland, particularly by the late Mr. *Buſhe*, one of the commiſſioners of the revenue there, according to the accounts which were then exhibited to the Houſe of Commons, the number of houſes in Ireland was computed at 701,102, which, reckoning 5 perſons to each houſe, gives 3,505,510 for the number of inhabitants; at $5\frac{1}{2}$, 3,856,061; and at 6, 4,206,612. Dr. *Beaufort* thinks it reaſonable, 'when 'we take into conſideration the great populouſneſs of 'the pooreſt cottages, the many crowded houſes in Dub-'lin and other large towns, and that the univerſity, bar-'racks, hoſpitals, and public offices are not included in 'the hearth-money returns' (according to which the number of houſes had been calculated), to rate the number of perſons, on the hypotheſis of only 701,102 houſes, at the medium reckoning of $5\frac{1}{2}$ to each houſe, and to ſtate the population on the whole at about 3,850,000‡. He appears to have had communications with Mr. *Buſhe* on the ſubject, and therefore this may be conjectured to have been alſo the opinion of that very accurate and intelligent perſon.

This laſt computation may, perhaps, be near the truth. My ſcepticiſm is chiefly with regard to the received opinions as to the population of Scotland, concerning

* Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. xviii. p. 446.

† P. 69. 72. 74.

‡ Memoir of a Map of Ireland, p. 142.

which, I think, I could adduce many facts and arguments, beſides the general conſiderations I have hinted at, to render it probable that it approaches nearer that of Ireland, though no doubt very conſiderably under it, than has of late been generally ſuppoſed.

Among the reaſons drawn from the ſuppoſed peculiar ſituation of Scotland before the Union, which are thought to ſhow that ſuch a meaſure might be very advantageous to that country, without being ſo to Ireland, are two, concerning which I will ſay a very few words. They have been adduced, I preſume, principally as inſtances of the comparative 'viciouſneſs* of the conſtitution of 'Scotland, and to juſtify the opinion that it was not 'worth preſerving†.'

1. One is, 'that the two Houſes ſat together,' i. e. that there were not two Houſes, 'and that the King, by 'his power of creating Peers, could at any time over-'power the voices of the Commons‡.'

2. The other, 'that the Scotch Parliament, even with 'this imperfect conſtitution, had not a deliberative 'power, becauſe it could diſcuſs no ſubject but what 'was previouſly prepared by the Lords of the Articles§.'

1. As to the firſt, there certainly was but one Houſe in the Scotch Parliament, which continued in that reſpect to reſemble the original form of the Engliſh; but

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 104. † Ibid. p. 102.
‡ P. 101. § Ibid.

it

it is a point of conſiderable doubt whether an act of that Parliament; which was originally conſidered as compoſed of four *diſtinct* eſtates, and after the abolition of the prelacy, and to the very laſt, of three; 1. Noblemen; 2. Barons, *i. e.* repreſentatives of ſhires; and, 3. Burrows, *i. e.* members for boroughs; was valid without a concurrence of the majority of each eſtate. There are great authorities on both ſides of the queſtion*; and the very doubt ſeems to prove that, in all caſes of importance, ſuch concurrence had, in fact, taken place. In the liſts of the diviſions on the treaty of Union, preſerved by *De Foe*, it appears that the votes of each eſtate were kept diſtinct; and that, on every queſtion divided upon and carried, there was a majority of each †. Be this point, however, as it may, it would ſeem that the Crown had not found it expedient to exerciſe its prerogative, by creating an exceſs in the number of Peers; for, in fact, at the time of the Union, the whole number of Noblemen in the Parliament of Scotland was but 154, while that of the Commoners was 156‡. Early in the preceding reign no leſs than twenty-ſix members for counties had been added at once to the repreſentative part of the legiſlature of Scotland ‖; afterwards an additional Parliamentary borough was erected; and a very ſhort time before the Union, Mr. *Fletcher* of Saltoun had propoſed to provide by ſtatute, 'that in all time coming, 'for every nobleman that ſhould be created there ſhould 'be a baron added to the Parliament §.' His motion

* *Craig* de Feudis, lib. i. dieg. 7. § 11. *Mackenzie*'s Inſtitutes, p. 402. *Wight* on Elections, p. 83.

† *De Foe*, Appendix, F. xx. p. 662. E. xx. p. 666.

‡ *De Foe*, *Wight*, *Robertſon*, &c.

‖ Sc. Acts, 1ſt Parl. 2d ſeſ. Will. & M. c. 11. 1690. p. 288.

§ *Fletcher*'s Works, p. 283.

did

did not indeed paſs; but from the known hiſtory of the act of ſecurity, which the popular intereſt in that very Parliament had been able not only to carry there, but to force the Queen to aſſent to, is it too much to conclude that if the method of outnumbering the Commoners by creating new Peers had been attempted, which is ſuppoſed to have been ſo eaſy, ſuch a motion would have been leſs unſucceſsful?

2. As to the Lords of the Articles, what has been obſerved on that ſubject is clearly the effect of overſight: many years before the Union, by an act of the Scotch Parliament ‖, that inſtitution had been totally aboliſhed, and it made as little a part of the conſtitution of Scotland in 1707, as the Court of Star-chamber or High Commiſſion Court did of that of England.

Before I quit this ſubject, of the advantages Scotland has derived from the Union, I muſt beg leave to take notice of a paſſage or two in '*Smith*'s Wealth of Nations;' from which, taken by themſelves, and, even in that detached ſtate ſingularly miſunderſtood and miſinterpreted, inferences have been drawn or ſurmiſed, as if that judicious and impartial writer had not conceived that that event had tended to improve the proſperity of his native country.

We have been told here, that he has imputed the increaſed trade of Scotland to the eſtabliſhment of banks. He has certainly ſaid, that within five-and-twenty or thirty years from the time in which he was writing, many private banking companies had been erected in every conſiderable town and in many country villages of

‖ Sc. Acts, 1ſt Parl. Will. & M. 2d ſeſ. c. 3. 1690, p. 220.

Scotland,

Scotland, and he gives it as his opinion, 'that the country 'had derived great benefit from that circumſtance*.' I have no intention to queſtion that opinion. The reaſons by which he ſupports it have great force; though, by the by, it is a remarkable circumſtance, that the period he mentions will be found very nearly to coincide with that from which Chief Baron *Foſter* had dated the beginning of the great ſpirit of improvement in Ireland; and which I have mentioned as the epoch of an accelerated progreſſion in that reſpect throughout the whole of the Britiſh dominions. But it will be found that Dr. *Smith*, in the very paſſage in queſtion, is very far from conſidering the banks, either public or private, as the excluſive cauſe of the increaſe of trade in Scotland. He ſays, 'he had heard it aſſerted, that the trade 'of Glaſgow had been doubled in about fifteen years 'after the firſt erection of banks there, and that the trade 'of Scotland had been more than quadrupled ſince the 'firſt erection of the public banks at Edinburgh; one 'in 1695, the other in 1727:' and immediately adds, 'if either of them have increaſed in this proportion, it 'ſeems to be an effect too great to be accounted for by 'the ſole operation of this cauſe†.'

Other paſſages, however, are mentioned as if directly in point, to ſhow that he did not think the Union promoted trade or manufactures in Scotland ‡. One is as follows: 'Of *all* commercial advantages which Scotland 'has derived from the Union, the riſe in the price of cattle 'is perhaps the greateſt §.' This is an extraordinary

* Vol. i. p. 442, 7th edition.
† Ibid. p. 443.
‡ Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 106.
§ *Smith*, vol. i. p. 348.

proof that he 'did not think that it derived *any* commercial advantages from it.' But it seems this must be a very poor advantage to *Scotland*, because the policy of *Ireland* has been to impose duties in order to check the export of live cattle *. Sir, till all the circumstances of the two cases shall have been compared, till it is made out that the imposition of those restrictive duties is good policy in Ireland, till it is then proved that, being so, it would have been good policy in regard to Scotland, and till it is shown that because a legislative Union between Scotland and England opened a free export of cattle from the former, therefore a similar Union between Ireland and Great Britain must necessarily open a like exportation from Ireland; till these positions are established, I do not see what possible advantage the able Advocate, who has resorted to the authority of Dr. *Smith* on this point, can derive from it in support of his argument. Dr. *Smith*'s favourite doctrine, if my memory does not mislead me, is, that agriculture is preferable to commerce, and that the commerce most connected with agriculture is the best †; and he mentions the effect of the Union in regard to the price of cattle in Scotland, to show that 'it has 'not only raised the value of lands in the Highlands, but 'has been the principal cause of the improvement of the 'low country ‡.'

Another passage referred to for the same purpose is this: 'The price of wool was reduced by the Union 'excluding it from the great markets in Europe, and 'confining it to the narrow one of England §.' Permi-

* Mr. *Foster*'s Speech, p. 106.
† Vol. iii. p. 136, &c. &c. &c.
‡ *Smith*, vol. i. p. 348, 349.
§ Mr. *Foster*'s Speech, p. 106.

me

me to add to this the part of the context which immediately follows, viz. 'The value of the greater part of 'the lands in the ſouthern counties, which are chiefly a 'ſheep country, would have been very deeply affected 'by this event, had not the riſe in the price of butcher's 'meat fully compenſated the fall in the price of wool *.' Taking the whole therefore together, which I ſuppoſe will be allowed to be the fair way, it is clear the author thought this reſtriction had, on the whole, been of no poſitive diſadvantage. But it is not a reſtriction confined to Scotland, nor any eſſential or neceſſary part of the treaty of Union; it was part of a general ſyſtem for the whole united kingdom, thought at the time,—and from the continuance of the laws againſt exportation, we muſt infer that it is ſtill thought ſo by the Legiſlature,—to be for the good of the whole. I am not now called upon, if I were competent, to give an opinion on this *vexata queſtio*; I will only obſerve, that the Parliament of Scotland had long acted on the ſame principle †; that if the United Legiſlature ſhall ever come to think that it is ſounder policy to allow the exportation of wool, there is nothing in the articles of Union to prevent the extenſion of that freedom to Scotland; and that in ſuch caſe it probably would be extended to that country. In the mean time it will be recollected that, for the conſent of Scotland at the time to admit of the prohibition, a valuable conſideration was to be paid out of the general equivalent ſtipulated for by the 15th article ‡ of the treaty.

Indeed, Sir, I cannot diſguiſe my aſtoniſhment that

* *Smith*, vol. i. p. 369.

† Scotch Acts, 7th Parl. Jac. 6. c. 123. An. 1581, 1ſt Parl. Car. 2. ſeſ. 1. c. 40. An. 1661.

‡ Vide *De Foe*, p. 403. 406. 444.

Dr. *Smith* ſhould have been called as a witneſs on the preſent occaſion; but as he has been produced, I hope I may be allowed to uſe the legal privilege permitted in ſuch caſes of a croſs-examination; and I will ſhow the Houſe by reading a paſſage where he expreſsly treats of a Union between Ireland and Great Britain, what the real ſentiments of that author were on the ſubject. The Gentlemen cannot diſpute either the credit or competency of an authority to which they themſelves have choſen to refer.

'By a Union with Great Britain, Ireland would gain, 'beſides the freedom of trade, other advantages much more 'important. By the Union with *England* the middling 'and inferior ranks of people in Scotland gained a com- 'plete deliverance from the power of an ariſtocracy which 'had before oppreſſed them. By a Union with *Great* 'Britain the greater part of the people of all ranks in 'Ireland would gain an equally complete deliverance from 'a much more oppreſſive ariſtocracy, not founded, like 'that of Scotland, in the natural and reſpectable diſtinc- 'tions of birth and fortune, but the moſt odious of all 'diſtinctions, which more than any other animate the inſo- 'lence of the oppreſſors, and the hatred and indignation of 'the oppreſſed, and which commonly render the inhabit- 'ants of the ſame country more hoſtile than thoſe of 'other countries ever are.—Without a Union with 'Great Britain the inhabitants of Ireland are not likely, 'for many ages, to conſider themſelves as one people*.'

Among the evils with which the opponents of a Union alarm the people of Ireland as likely to befal their country from that meaſure, are, an increaſed emigration,

* Vol. iii. p. 460.

and

and the permanent or temporary non-reſidence of a great number of perſons of rank and opulence *.

The general complaint againſt abſentees is of a very long ſtanding. For my own part, I have never been of the number of thoſe who imagine that law and poſitive regulation can with effect, or ought in propriety to be applied in reſtriction of the natural liberty which belongs to every individual, of fixing his reſidence, exerciſing his talents and induſtry, or ſpending his income, wherever he thinks it moſt convenient or agreeable. A general *ne exeant regno* would be a ſtrange part of the ſyſtem of any government, and that country muſt be of a ſingular deſcription which requires that its natives ſhould be impriſoned within its limits by the ſanction of penal laws and pecuniary mulcts. If you can but reſtore, or rather eſtabliſh tranquillity, police, the ſecurity of life and property, in Ireland, depend upon it the happy ſoil and ſalubrious climate of that favoured iſland, its almoſt unrivalled advantages for trade and agriculture, added to the powerful ſentiment which attaches mankind in general, with a fond prepoſſeſſion, to the place whjch gave them birth, will fix at home, or attract with all the riches their abilities or diligence may have acquired for them in other parts of the world, ſuch numbers of Iriſhmen now prompted to emigrate or detained from returning by the unſettled ſtate of their native country, as will more than counterbalance whatever non-reſidence may ariſe from the periodical ſittings of the common Parliament in Great Britain.

That non-reſidence will be only occaſional. It will

* Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 62. 64. 91. 93. Vide ſome important obſervations on the ſubject of abſentees, Subſtance of Lord *Sheffield*'s Speech, p. 29, &c.

reach little further than the members of the Legiſlature and their families. The ſeat of judicature and the local executive government will, I preſume, continue where they are; and I believe thoſe who frequent the gayer walks of life will not ſuppoſe that the votaries of pleaſure and diſſipation in Ireland will think the circumſtance of the Iriſh Parliamentary repreſentation reſorting to London any great addition to the allurements of that place. That part of the population of this metropolis and of Bath will remain pretty much as before.

Indeed, I cannot help thinking there are ſeveral ſtrong reaſons in favour of the probability, that, on the whole, the fear entertained of a diminution of wealth and population by an increaſe of abſentees would not be verified by the event.

Will the Houſe give me leave here to recall to their recollection the obſervation of a Noble Lord * on this part of the argument, which ſtruck me as of great weight, namely, that the importance of a ſeat in the united and imperial Legiſlature, the election to which, whether in Great Britain or Ireland, would then be indifferent to many perſons anxious to obtain it, would be felt by men poſſeſſed of property and intereſt in the latter kingdom as much greater than that of one in her preſent local Parliament. They would therefore have a more powerful motive for attending to the cultivation of their influence there; and this could only be done effectually by frequent reſidence on their eſtates, and the expenditure of a conſiderable part of their Iriſh income, perhaps of their Engliſh alſo, in Ireland. This muſt particularly happen in regard to county elections, in favour of which ſort of repreſentation I make no ſcruple to acknowlege my predi-

* Lord *Hawkeſbury*.

lection,

ſection, and to thoſe in towns where the right is popular and extenſive *.

If the abſence of perſons of diſtinction and fortune were to increaſe, we have heard the very reſpectable opinion of an Honourable Gentleman †, who ſeemed to ſpeak on the ſubject from reflection and perſonal obſervation, and who muſt be conſidered as deſerving peculiar attention in regard to it, that the merchant and manufacturer would probably feel their means and diſpoſition for exertion expand, and their efforts become more ſucceſsful; that they would, as it were, breathe a freer air, by the removal from their neighbourhood, of the ſplendour and dignity of rank and hereditary opulence; and that, as the flouriſhing condition of trade and manufactures naturally tends to augment the population of a country, this effect would much more than counteract the miſchief apprehended. The Honourable Gentleman ſpoke indeed with liberal and laudable ſentiments of reſpect for that ariſtocracy, which forms ſo eſſential a part of our excellent conſtitution, but he ſeemed to entertain the idea that commerce and induſtry, though they live by the demands and conſumption of the great, thrive beſt at a diſtance from them—

Urit enim fulgore ſuo qui prægravat artes
Infra ſe poſitas.

With great deference, however, to the Honourable Gentleman, I muſt expreſs my doubts on this point, though it is one of which I acknowlege him to be much better qualified to judge than I am. I doubt the juſtneſs

* I think we have alſo Mr. *Foſter*'s authority for this: 'In county 'elections and popular boroughs no man now an abſentee can ex-'pect to be choſen.' p. 91.

† Mr. *Peele*.

of

of his opinion, becauſe it both differs from the moſt general ſentiment, and militates againſt the arguments in favour of that frequent and eaſy intercourſe between the different, but intimately connected orders and claſſes of our great civil and political ſyſtem, which is ſo gratifying to our feelings, and ſeems ſo conſonant to reaſon.

But as to the ſuppoſed tendency of a parliamentary Union to produce an increaſed emigration and non-reſidence of the great in Ireland, I own I conſider the experimental knowledge we have, in this as in other reſpects, derived from the caſe of Scotland, as of much more weight than any conjectural *à priori* arguments which can be ſuggeſted on the one ſide or the other.

It has often been ſtated, and indeed never denied, that no nobility and gentry reſide more at home than thoſe of that country. They almoſt univerſally paſs the ſummer on their eſtates, occupied in the pleaſures of rural hoſpitality and the improvement of the national agriculture by encouragement and example; and many of them ſpend the reſt of the year in Edinburgh. The wonderful advances that Capital of the country has made in its ſize, population, wealth, convenience, and elegance, ſince the Union and removal of its Parliament, are notorious from univerſal report to all, and from perſonal knowledge to many who hear me. I will not ſay that the Union has cauſed this; that it has had a chief ſhare in producing the great general improvement in Scotland, I think I have ſhown to be extremely probable; but it is evident, at leaſt, that the Union has not prevented the increaſed proſperity of Edinburgh.

Yet the advocates againſt that meaſure in Scotland were

were as loud and as positive in their prophecies, that this ancient seat of Majesty, on the removal of the Legislature, would sink into poverty, misery, and desolation, as many in Ireland have been of late, on similar grounds, in foretelling to the great and respectable metropolis of that kingdom, that its ruin will be the infallible and speedy consequence of the measure now under consideration. Indeed the common people of Dublin have had this topic so impressed on their minds in every possible way, that many of them, I believe, have at last been brought almost to give literal credit to the ironical prediction, that when the Parliament shall cease to sit there, the town will become such a perfect *rus in urbe*, as to furnish a new source of provisions for victualling the British fleet by the extensive pastures into which its streets and squares are to be converted. It seems almost ridiculous to say that such sort of arguments can have succeeded, yet I verily believe they have to a very considerable degree. Nay, more, I have seen it asserted in some publication against the proposed Union, with a confidence which hardly could have existed without the author's own belief of the fact, that Edinburgh, whatever may be pretended to the contrary, has, in truth, been in a constant state of decay ever since the loss of the Parliament. The only answer such an ignorant assertion seems to deserve, is that ludicrous one I have read in one of the polemical writers in favour of the measure, who supposes himself to be told by a correspondent that he has found with regret the fact was really so; for that upon inquiry among some gentlemen and ladies, natives of Scotland, and inhabitants of Edinburgh, they had assured him, that that ancient city had suffered so very much from the fatal event of the Union, that the Scotch had been actually under the necessity of building a very large new one close to it.

Sir, a learned gentleman of our ſiſter kingdom, whoſe tract againſt the Union is certainly the performance of a man of abilities *, has, however, a very curious way of arguing on the fact, which he admits, that the Union has not occaſioned emigration and non-reſidence in Scotland; but the analogy of which, in regard to what there may be reaſon to expect in the caſe of Ireland, he will by no means allow. The fact he admits in theſe very ſtrong terms: 'Can there be adduced five inſtances 'of men of rank in Scotland, however powerful and ex-'tended their Engliſh connexions, whoſe chief or leaſt 'temporary reſidence is not in Scotland †?' And again: 'A Scotch abſentee is only a political or commercial 'ſpeculator, who will in the end enrich and adorn his 'native country: his money, acquired where it may be, 'and after abſence ever ſo long, centers there ‡.'

But this, it ſeems, is all the anomalous effect of a peculiar nationality in the Scotch §, which a ſimilarity of circumſtances has no tendency to produce in any other people, and eſpecially not in the Iriſh; though many of the inhabitants of one part of that country are not very diſtant deſcendants from Scottiſh anceſtors, and moſt of the reſt throughout the kingdom are probably either ſprung from one common Celtic ſtock with the Highlanders, or elſe of that Saxon or Teutonic race who appear, in the early ages of the Chriſtian æra, to have over-run and ſettled themſelves in all the low country of Scotland as well as of England.

* A Reply, &c. by *Richard Jebb*, Eſq.

† Ibid. p. 49. ‡ Ibid. § Ibid.

An

An Iriſhman, it ſeems, is a being of a different ſort. 'Scarcely an inſtance,' it is ſaid, 'occurs of the wealth 'and influence obtained by Iriſhmen in England, produ-'cing advantage to Ireland: they ſeem aſhamed of the 'name, and eager to diveſt themſelves of all pretenſions 'to it*.'

Alas! Sir, it is painful to ſee that men of underſtanding can reſort to ſuch grounds of oppoſition, or ſuffer themſelves to fall into reaſonings and opinions ſcarcely fit for the moſt vulgar minds, and entirely unworthy of the cultivated ſenſe which ſeems to belong to this gentleman, and ought to be the attribute of all who profeſs themſelves either lawyers or ſtateſmen.

If the difference in the general conduct of the Iriſh and Scotch were really as notorious as he has perſuaded himſelf it is, the experiment of the effects of an Union upon the former has not been tried, and he does not appear to have made any inquiry how the caſe ſtood as to abſentees from Scotland previous to 1707. He found an eaſier ſolution of the ſuppoſed difference in the hackneyed imputation or praiſe of Scotch nationality; he ſays it is *a praiſe*†, and when duly regulated I think it is, though I verily believe not more due to the Scotch than, where circumſtances happen to be ſimilar, to the Yorkſhire, Corniſh, or Welſh man; or indeed to Frenchmen, Swedes, Danes, Germans, or Italians.

I imagine this gentleman would take it very ill, I think with reaſon, if a ſtranger were to pronounce ſo

* A Reply, &c. by *Richard Jebb*, Eſq. p. 49.
† Ibid. p. 50.

unjuſt a judgment as he has done upon his countrymen. Unjuſt I certainly think it is; I myſelf could mention various ſtriking inſtances to the contrary of what he has alleged. I could ſelect from many others the example of a reſpectable Nobleman of that country, who, after filling with great honour and credit ſome of the principal offices of government here, retired to Ireland, and ſucceſsfully devoted the remainder of his life to the improvement of that part of the kingdom where his chief property lay; having ever been, through the courſe of his political life, a watchful guardian of the intereſts and well-being of the whole. I mean the late Lord *Hillſborough*, whom I mention with the more pleaſure, becauſe he who underſtood the affairs of Ireland ſo well, is known to have been always a ſtrenuous and anxious advocate for a legiſlative Union. Sir, I could in like manner ſpecify examples of Iriſh gentlemen in other walks of life, who having by their talents and exertions in remote countries, in the Eaſt and in the Weſt, acquired eminence and fortune, have returned to their native land, and, veſting their riches in purchaſes there, have become active and uſeful magiſtrates, able commanders of the national troops, and members both of the one and the other Houſe of Parliament.

But even if it were true, that ſuch inſtances have been more rare in Ireland than in Scotland, would it be any very extravagant conjecture to ſuppoſe, that the real reaſons have been the greater tranquillity which prevails in the one in conſequence of a Union, and the more turbulent and unſettled ſtate of the other for want of it? Would not thoſe indiſputable circumſtances of difference account for ſuch a difference in the conduct of the natives of the two countries, more ſatisfactorily than ſuppoſed diſtinc-

tions

tions of national character, which may ſerve to amuſe in a farce, or occaſion merriment or quarrels in a coffee-houſe, but can never be entitled to hold a place in grave diſcuſſion or ſerious debate?

But, Sir, the Gentlemen who in this place have reſiſted the progreſs of the buſineſs now again brought before us;—as well thoſe who object to the competency and general expediency;—as well the very few who I think have gone the length of declaring a rooted opinion, that the Union never can, at any time, or with any ſort of conſent, be adviſable;—as thoſe who profeſs, ſome a *belief*, others even a *wiſh*, that it may at ſome future period be adopted;—all appear to concur in contending, that the preſent time and occaſion are unfit; that the people of Ireland are not prepared; that they have not been habituated to the contemplation of the meaſure, as thoſe of Scotland had been for above a century; that they have inveterate prejudices againſt it, which have now univerſally manifeſted themſelves, and which ought to be firſt by gentle and gradual means removed: whereas, as has alſo been alledged, it was always the favourite project of Scotland. Laſtly, two other plans have been propounded,—plans widely different the one from the other,—by which it is ſuppoſed that thoſe diſorders and misfortunes of Ireland which a legiſlative Union would only exaggerate, might be cured, and the dangers which are apprehended even to Great Britain from ſuch a Union, prevented.

As to the time, I differ ſo much from thoſe Gentlemen, that if on other occaſions the meaſure would have been *wiſe*, I believe it has now become *neceſſary*. In ſupport of which opinion, I cannot imagine a more convincing

argument than the avowed, *the long avowed*, fear of a *Union*, among that too numerous claſs of men in Ireland, who have now openly profeſſed their plan and object to be, a *Separation*. I need not again mention the declarations of *Tone*, of the confeſſions of *Emmet*, *M'Nevin*, and others. The proof is deeply engraven on all our memories. It has been written in characters of blood over the whole face of that deſolated iſland. But when I know that the aſſociates of thoſe very men by whom the arms were forged which were intended for the deſtruction of the true independency, liberty, and conſtitution of their country, and who prepared that moral and political poiſon which was to corrupt and extinguiſh every virtuous and religious, every Britiſh principle, in the minds of their countrymen, are full of trembling apprehenſions, leſt this ſalutary antidote ſhould be adminiſtered in time—can I, aware as I am of the profound no leſs than wicked views, and the no leſs extraordinary than perverted talents of ſome of thoſe men—can I withſtand ſuch ſtrong confirmation of the opinion, which on other, and more general grounds, forces itſelf ſo powerfully on my mind, that we are come at laſt to that only alternative, *ſpeedy Union*, or *early Separation?*

As to thoſe other and more general grounds to which I have once before alluded, I wiſh I could, conſiſtently with the orders of the Houſe, refer to the ſtrong and demonſtrative reaſoning concerning them, which ſome of us may have had an opportunity of hearing delivered elſewhere *. They are among the moſt important branches of the ſubject, but are too copious and extenſive for me to enter upon at preſent.

* Lord *Minto*'s Speech in the Houſe of Lords, 11th April 1799, ſince printed.

It

It is ſaid, we ought to wait for a moment of peace and general tranquillity. If by this is underſtood general internal tranquillity in Ireland, I am afraid, to judge of the future by the paſt, the adjournment muſt be, as my Right Hon. Friend † deſcribed it, *ad Græcas Kalendas*. But are we to wait till the general peace of Europe ſhall be reſtored? Alas! there ſeems at preſent no very near or diſtinct epoch diſcernible for that happy event. And in the mean time, our enemies, in directing their arts and their arms to their favourite object of wreſting from us our ſiſter kingdom, are to enjoy the advantages accruing to them, both from the want of a true political conſent of parts in the preſent complex and ill-conſtructed machine of our imperial legiſlation, and from the cunning induſtry of their revolutionary allies in Ireland, who even now are endeavouring to obtain the co-operation of ſome of the men who have hitherto been their moſt determined foes, and the moſt zealous friends of Great Britain, by working on their blind and unfounded jealouſy of the Britiſh Parliament, and entrapping thoſe infatuated perſons into a conduct which, if not counteracted, may enable them to accompliſh the fatal end of their deteſtable conſpiracies.

Was the Union in Scotland undertaken or carried into effect in a time of external or domeſtic peace? Far otherwiſe. But then it is ſaid, that when it was negotiated and completed, the arms of Great Britain and her allies * were triumphant. In anſwer to this, it need only be obſerved, that the treaty muſt be conſidered as

† Mr. *Windham*.

* The ſucceſs of his Majeſty's allies, ſince the time when this was ſtated, has fortunately rendered the parallel more exact in that particular than it could then have been contended to be.

having

having been commenced and in progreſs from the very beginning of the reign of Queen Anne, and when affairs abroad wore a very gloomy aſpect. As to thoſe at home, they muſt have caſt a very careleſs, or a very partial eye, on that period of our hiſtory, who do not perceive, in the circumſtances of a diſputed ſucceſſion, the yet recent concuſſion of the Revolution, the numerous adherents of the exiled family in both kingdoms, the jarring intereſts of the two countries, and the diſſenſions between them on account of religion and commerce, a complication of political difficulties as great, though of a different nature, perhaps much greater, than any that exiſts at preſent.

In truth, though at firſt ſight it appears reaſonable to think that times of tranquillity are beſt adapted to the diſcuſſion and accompliſhment of great political arrangements, this ſpeculation, on cloſer attention, does not ſeem to be warranted, either by the nature or hiſtory of mankind. On the contrary, I believe it will be found, that men and nations are too indolent for great exertions, 'enterpriſes of pith and moment,' while in the undiſturbed enjoyment of quiet proſperity; and that to all their moſt memorable efforts of that ſort, they have been ſtimulated by the urgency of perſonal or national calamity, or at leaſt of private or public difficulties and embarraſſment.

I admit that the idea of a legiſlative Union was long familiar in Scotland; but I deny that it now comes unawares, and by ſurpriſe, upon Ireland. I am, on the contrary, well perſuaded, that ſuch a plan for that country muſt have been uniformly preſent to the minds (I will not ſay always in the intention) of every miniſter, every

ſtateſman, every politician, every enlightened member of Parliament, every man, in ſhort, in that kingdom, qualified and entitled to judge of ſuch queſtions, for a ſpace of time conſiderably longer than what elapſed between the Union of the Crowns and that of the Parliaments of this country. I will endeavour to prove this to the ſatisfaction of the Houſe, by a deduction of clear, hiſtorical facts.

To ſay nothing of the actual, though imperfect and illegal incorporation under the Uſurper, you know, Sir, that in the reign of Charles II. by a Report of the Council of Trade in Ireland to the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council there, dated the 25th of March 1676, that Board expreſsly recommended, 'That endeavours 'ſhould be uſed for the Union of the kingdoms under 'one legiſlative power, proportionably, as was here-'tofore done in the caſe of Wales.' I cite the very words of the Report, which is ſtated to have been drawn by Sir *William Petty*, and who, in his treatiſe called 'The Political Anatomy of Ireland,' written, I believe, a few years before, had delivered his individual opinion to the ſame purpoſe. 'If,' ſays he, 'both 'kingdoms were under one legiſlative power and 'Parliament, the numbers whereof ſhould be pro-'portionable in power and wealth of each nation, there 'would be no danger ſuch a Parliament ſhould do any 'thing to the prejudice of the Engliſh intereſt in Ire-'land; nor could the Iriſh ever complain of partiality, 'when they ſhall be freely and proportionably repre-'ſented in all Legiſlatures *.'

* *Petty*'s Political Anatomy of Ireland, p. 31.

In

In the year 1798, Mr. *Molyneux*, in that paſſage of his famous pamphlet called 'The Caſe of Ireland,' which was mentioned by the firſt authority in this Houſe in the Committee on the Reſolutions †, clearly points to a repreſentation of Ireland in a united Parliament as a moſt deſirable arrangement for that country. His words are theſe:

'If, from theſe laſt-mentioned records, it be concluded that the Parliament of England may bind Ireland, it muſt alſo be allowed that the people of Ireland ought to have their repreſentatives in the Parliament of England. And this I believe we ſhould be willing enough to embrace; but this is an happineſs we can hardly hope for ‡.'

And here I cannot help noticing a very ſingular fraud, or negative ſort of forgery, committed in an edition of *Molyneux*'s work, which was printed in Dublin in the year 1783. In that edition the words 'and this I believe we ſhould be willing enough to embrace: but this is a happineſs we can hardly hope for;' were totally omitted. This circumſtance I firſt ſaw pointed out in a note to a very able pamphlet lately publiſhed, entitled, 'Reaſons for adopting an Union between Great Britain and Ireland.' I have ſince been favoured by the author of that pamphlet with a copy of the caſtrated edition, the publiſher of which could not have proved ſo ſtrongly, in any other way, at once his own hoſtility to the meaſure of a Union, and the ſenſe he juſtly entertained of the

† Vide Mr. *Addington*'s Speech, p. 18.

‡ London edition in 1770, p. 74. There is a preface to this edition, reported to have been written by the late Mr. *Flood*, with which it was republiſhed in Dublin in 1773.

weight

weight of ſuch an opinion in its favour as that of *Molyneux*, the able and learned advocate of Iriſh independency.

But, Sir, in 1703, at the time when a ſimilar meaſure was ſo particularly in the contemplation of the Engliſh Government with regard to Scotland, a legiſlative Union was in a manner ſued for, and ſued for in vain, by the Parliament of Ireland. This appears ſufficiently from the Journals of the two Houſes of that Parliament; but I have had an opportunity alſo of ſeeing the correſpondence at that time of the Duke of *Ormond*, then Lord Lieutenant, and of his Chief Secretary Mr. *Southwell*, and the Lord Chancellor *Cox*, with the Government here, from which it is ſtill more manifeſt that many of the leading characters in the country, the Chancellor particularly, Mr. *Brodrick* the Speaker, and I think even the Secretary himſelf, were very deſirous of the meaſure, but that the Lord Lieutenant was lukewarm, and the miniſtry in England totally averſe to it.

That Parliament met on the 21ſt of September, and on the 1ſt of October the Lords voted an addreſs to the Queen, which concluded with theſe words: 'As we are 'ſenſible our preſervation is owing to our being united 'to the Crown of England, ſo we are convinced it 'would tend to our farther ſecurity and happineſs to 'have a more comprehenſive and entire Union with that 'kingdom *.' I ſhall ſhow immediately the anſwer ſent from England to this addreſs.

As it appears not to have been the intention of the Adminiſtration here to liſten to ſuch a ſuggeſtion for the

* Iriſh Lords' Journals, vol. ii. p. 8.

kingdom of Ireland, and ſupplies, not general meaſures of policy, ſeeming to have been conſidered as the material buſineſs of the ſeſſion, one is not ſurpriſed to diſcover in Mr. *Southwell*'s firſt diſpatches on its opening, conſiderable impatience *as a miniſter*, whatever his *private* opinion as to a Union might be, at finding the Houſe of Commons more willing to deliberate on matters of that ſort, than ready to ſatisfy the pecuniary exigencies of the Government. On the 25th, in a letter to Lord *Nottingham*, he ſays, 'It is a miſerable fatigue we are 'under. We are forced to uſe a great deal of claret, 'and a great many arguments, and all little enough. 'There is a moſt ſtrange mixture of Scotch and fana-'tical principles, which ſours the maſs. They are jea-'lous of every thing; and were it not that my Lord 'Lieutenant has a great perſonal intereſt, nothing at all 'would be done.' This he means in regard to the ſup-plies, which the Lord Lieutenant endeavoured to obtain for three years, but which attempt, after every effort, he was obliged to abandon, a grant even for two having paſſed with difficulty.

In a ſhort time, both Houſes formed themſelves into Committees on the ſtate of the nation. Two days before that of the Houſe of Commons ſat, Mr. *Southwell* writes to Lord *Nottingham*† his conjectures about the event, as follows: 'Next Monday is appointed to conſider of the ſtate 'of the nation; and I believe it will end in this, after 'conſidering ſome difficulties they lie under, to make 'ſome repreſentation, full of temper and moderation, 'for gaining ſome relief in thoſe points; *and many even 'talk of a Union.*'

† Oct. 2, 1703.

When

When the Committee took place, it appears that the wiſh for that meaſure was ſtill more general than he had foreſeen.

'This day,' ſays he, in a letter written at night to the ſame Nobleman ‡, 'the Houſe of Commons had 'appointed to go into the ſtate of the nation; and after 'ſome hours ſitting, and conſidering the many misfor-'tunes the country lay under, in point of trade and 'other circumſtances, *all the ſpeakers concluded, that they 'did, in the moſt earneſt manner, deſire a Union with Eng-'land*, and they have appointed Friday next to conſider 'that matter, and how to repreſent the ſame to the 'Lord Lieutenant, to lay it before her Majeſty, that her 'Majeſty may interpoſe with the Parliament of England 'in that affair. I muſt needs own, that the great tem-'per and good diſpoſition of the debate ſurpriſed moſt 'people; and thoſe things which ſeemed to be the loud-'eſt grievances were touched with all the true ſenſe, but 'at the ſame time with the true diſpoſition, as if they 'deſired nothing more, which I hope will incline the 'next ſeſſion §, by her Majeſty's mediation, to cultivate 'this good diſpoſition.'

It is from the tenour of this letter, and ſome others in the ſame ſpirit, that I infer both that the ſober wiſh and opinion of the leading men was ſtrongly in favour of a Union, and that Mr. *Southwell* himſelf was inclined to it.

‡ Oct. 4.

§ *i. e.* Of the *Engliſh* Parliament, which met in the beginning of the following month, Nov. 1703.

The Houſe ſat in the Committee on ſeveral different days; and it appears * that the Speaker, Mr. *Brodrick*, took an active part in framing certain reſolutions, which were reported by Mr. *Moleſworth*, the Chairman, on the 11th; and the laſt of which was, 'that her Majeſty be 'moſt humbly moved, that through her princely good-'neſs, and wiſdom, and favourable interpoſition, her 'ſubjects of this kingdom may be relieved from the 'calamities they now lie under, by a full enjoyment of 'their conſtitution, *or a more firm and ſtrict Union with* 'England †.'

Theſe reſolutions were afterwards formed into a Repreſentation addreſſed to the Queen, which concluded nearly to the ſame effect. The Repreſentation was voted on the 20th of October.

On the 25th the Houſe of Lords reſolved, 'Upon due 'conſideration of the preſent conſtitution of this king-'dom, that ſuch an humble repreſentation be made to 'the Queen, of the ſtate and condition thereof, as may 'beſt incline her Majeſty, by ſuch proper means as to 'her Majeſty ſhall ſeem fit, for promoting ſuch an 'Union with England as may qualify the ſtates of this 'kingdom to be repreſented in the Parliament there ‡.'

I do not find that any farther ſtep was taken by that Houſe in conſequence of this reſolution. The Queen's anſwer to their addreſs was couched in obliging terms, but

* Mr. *Southwell*'s Letter to Lord *Nottingham*, 9th Oct. 1703.

† Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, vol. iii. p. 45.

‡ Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, vol. ii. p. 29.

took

took no notice whatever of the ſuggeſtion relative to a Union §.

That to the Repreſentation of the Commons was in leſs gracious language: 'Her Majeſty having conſidered 'of the Repreſentation made by the Houſe of Commons 'in Ireland, has commanded this anſwer to be returned: 'That the firſt part ſeems to relate to matters paſt in 'Parliament, and the other part' (in which a Union was mentioned) 'conſiſting only of things in general, 'her Majeſty can give no particular anſwer at preſent, 'but will take them into her conſideration.'

It was not received till the 11th of February ‖, at an interval of near four months from the delivery of the Repreſentation to the Lord Lieutenant ¶.

It is difficult to conceive what good reaſons could have been ſtated by the Adminiſtration of England at that time for rejecting, in ſo harſh and diſdainful a manner, advances towards a meaſure which, as the Iriſh Commons juſtly obſerved in their Repreſentation, would unqueſtionably have been to the advantage of that kingdom. Whatever *ratio juſtificativa* they might have been able to plead, it is probable the *ratio ſuaſoria* was, that the buſineſs was chiefly promoted in Ireland by the party they ſuppoſed hoſtile to themſelves. To ſhow how little difficulty the carrying of it into execution was likely to have encountered there, in addition to what I have already ſtated, I will read the concluding paragraph of a

§ It was dated Windſor, 12th Oct. 1703, and communicated to the Lords in Ireland on the 19th of that month. Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, vol. ii. p. 24.

‖ Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, vol. iii. p. 168.

¶ Oct. 22. Ibid. p. 70. 74.

letter

letter from Sir *Richard Cox*, the Chancellor, to Lord *Nottingham*, dated Feb. 13, 1703-4:

'There is no remedy ſo proper for both kingdoms as 'ſome ſort of Union, which would conduce to enrich and 'ſtrengthen England, and eſtabliſh the Engliſh intereſt 'here, and make it proſper; for in that caſe all the Britiſh 'would be good Engliſhmen; and *ſince we do not capitu-late, and you may be your own carvers*, it ſeems worthy 'your ſerious thoughts to promote ſo good a work.'

And let not Gentlemen ſuppoſe that the Union was then conſidered merely as a refuge from the abject condition of a ſubordinate Legiſlature. Whatever topics the warmth of oppoſition may have introduced into the Repreſentation of the Iriſh Commons, the tranſactions of both Houſes during that ſeſſion completely prove how fully they acted as the uncontrolled branches of a Parliament perfectly *ſui juris*. The Commons with difficulty granted ſupplies for two years, inſtead of the three which had been demanded; and this, after calculating the eſtabliſhment on the loweſt ſcale, and debiting the Treaſury with the outſtanding arrears of revenue, contrary to former practice. The other Houſe, without regard to any offence which might be taken in England, by a ſolemn reſolution aſſerted their ſupreme and excluſive right of appeal, and actually exerciſed it by iſſuing an order under which the Earl of *Meath* was put in poſſeſſion of an eſtate, directly in the teeth of a decree of the Houſe of Lords in England *.

* Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, vol. ii. p. 24. 28. 30. 34, 35, 36. 41, 42. 44. 52, 53. 62.

The

The ſpirit of that Houſe in the buſineſs of their judicature may be farther judged of from a paragraph in the letter I have already quoted of Sir *Richard Cox* to Lord *Nottingham*: 'Your Lordſhip may be pleaſed to 'remember, that from the beginning, and particularly 'in the cloſet before my Lord Treaſurer, I expreſſed 'more apprehenſion from the debates of the Lords than 'of the Commons; for I knew the former would think 'themſelves bound in honour to vindicate a juriſdiction 'they claim as inſeparably inherent to a Houſe of 'Lords, and which they might conceive the Lords in 'England could not oppoſe without ſhaking their own 'foundations.'

About the time when theſe proceedings were going on in the Parliament, the ſubject of a Union between Ireland and this country appears by many publications to have been a very general topic of diſcuſſion out of doors.

Sir *Thomas Brewſter*, who had been a member of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, publiſhed, in the year 1702, a pamphlet, entitled, '*New Eſſays on Trade*,' in which there is a long chapter on the ſubject. I will not trouble the Houſe with all his reaſoning upon it, though it is clearly that of an intelligent and ſenſible man, but I beg leave to read the following ſhort paſſage:

'By this meaſure future rebellions would be pre-'vented, which that kingdom was never long free from. 'Ireland would be then England, and the nation become 'more formidable abroad and ſafer at home—Ireland 'making, as it were, one continent with this iſland, 'which it would become in effect, and more uſefully 'than if it were ſo in reality.'

In a book printed in the ſame year, entitled, '*Miſcellanea Aulica*,' there is a ſhort paper with this ſuperſcription, 'A Propoſal of ſeveral Officers, and other 'Gentlemen of Engliſh Extraction in Ireland, for a 'Union of that Kingdom with England.' There is no date to it; but it muſt have been originally drawn up either in the reign of Charles II. or of King William, as appears by this introductory paragraph:

'*His* Majeſty's good ſubjects in Ireland, upon the 'hearing of a propoſal made not long ſince for the 'uniting England and Scotland' (there was, I believe, no ſuch propoſal in James the Second's time), 'with all 'obedience and ſubmiſſion humbly conceive it a means 'conducible thereto, if the like Union of England and 'Ireland, under *one legiſlative power aſſembled in one 'Parliament*, might be reſettled *de jure*, in ſomething 'like the manner it was formerly *de facto*, to the facili-'tating his Majeſty's gracious government of both 'kingdoms, diſſolving of many intricate difficulties, 'taking away much of the root of difference and diſ-'cord between the now many parties in his Majeſty's 'ſaid kingdoms, and ſtrengthening his hands againſt all 'oppoſition, both at home and abroad.'

It ſeems pretty clear, from the title and ſtyle of this propoſal, that it was deſigned to be laid before Government, and was the act of ſome known and conſiderable claſs of perſons; ſo that it moſt probably was a matter of general notoriety.

I will mention one other publication of that time, which expreſsly purports to have been ſubmitted to the conſideration of Queen Anne and her Parliament. The title

title is, 'An Eſſay upon an Union of Ireland with England, moſt humbly offered to the Conſideration of the Queen's moſt excellent Majeſty and both Houſes of Parliament.' The date, in the copy I have ſeen, is 'Dublin, reprinted, 1704.'

This author ſtates his opinion, that while Ireland continues a diſtinct kingdom, the only precautions England can take to prevent any danger that may ariſe to it from that country, are, 1ſt, to entruſt the Government there entirely in the hands of Engliſhmen; or, 2dly, to check the growth of that kingdom in point of trade and wealth, ſo that it may not be able to attempt any thing againſt the conſtitution of England. He afterwards enters into a variety of arguments to ſhow the equal injuſtice and impolicy of either of thoſe methods, and then comes to his propoſal of a Union, which he ſupports in a manner very clear and forcible, on conſiderations reſpecting the intereſts and relative ſituation of the two kingdoms, proving himſelf (whoever he was) to have been a perſon of more than ordinary information and abilities.

Thus, Sir, I think I have ſhown that this idea, now ſaid to be ſo novel to Ireland, muſt have been in the general contemplation of all thinking people in that country from the days of *Cromwell* to the period of the Union of England and Scotland.

Upon that event the hopes of thoſe true patriots in Ireland, as I muſt conſider them, who wiſhed for the bleſſing of a like Union to their own country, ſeem to have revived, while the Engliſh Miniſters of that day continued to feel the ſame diſinclination to it, which had

been manifeſted by thoſe in power at the beginning of the reign.

In the ſpeech of the Earl of *Pembroke*, then Lord Lieutenant, at the opening of the ſeſſion on the 7th of July 1707, ſo memorable and important an occurrence as the Union with Scotland, was not even mentioned *. But the Commons that very day reſolved on an addreſs of congratulation to her Majeſty, 'on the accompliſhment of the 'great work of uniting her Majeſty's kingdoms of Eng-'land and Scotland †.' Mr. *Brodrick* was chairman of the committee who prepared it, and it is drawn in ſuch warm language of admiration as clearly evinces how great an impreſſion the ſubject had made: 'We crave 'leave to lay hold of the earlieſt opportunity humbly to 'addreſs your Majeſty with our moſt hearty and ſincere 'congratulations, for the inward joy and ſatisfaction you 'are bleſſed with, and the glory you have acquired by 'accompliſhing the Union of your Majeſty's kingdoms 'of England and Scotland. This great and glorious work, 'which your anceſtors, with their utmoſt endeavours, la-'boured to accompliſh, lay above the reach and wiſdom 'of former times, and ſeems to have been reſerved by 'Heaven for your Majeſty's reign, as one great reward 'of an exemplary piety and heroic virtue, ſignally de-'monſtrated in what you have reſolutely undertaken, and 'ſucceſsfully carried on, to procure the general happineſs, 'and ſecure the liberty of Europe. The difficulty of the 'attempt required the greateſt genius to ſurmount it; 'and we cannot but highly honour and admire the 'wiſdom of thoſe councils that have by it given a further

* Journals of the Iriſh Lords, vol. ii. p. 153. Of the Houſe of Commons, vol. iii. p. 364.

† Journals of Iriſh Commons, vol. iii. p. 365.

'ſecurity

'ſecurity to the peace and ſafety of your Majeſty's govern-
'ment, the Proteſtant ſucceſſion, and the church as by
'law eſtabliſhed in England and Ireland. *May God put*
'*it in your royal heart to add greater ſtrength and luſtre to*
'*your crown, by a ſtill more comprehenſive Union* ‡.'

The Lords expreſſed themſelves to the ſame effect, though not quite in ſuch direct terms: 'We congratu-
'late the glorious ſucceſs of your Majeſty's endeavours
'for ſecuring, by your arms abroad, the liberties of Eu-
'rope, and the welfare of your ſubjects at home, by
'uniting Great Britain into one body under the ſame
'Proteſtant ſucceſſion to the throne of all your dominions.
'We are ſenſible how effectual a means that will prove
'to prevent the attempts of Papiſts from diſturbing the
'quiet of your Majeſty's empire, and particularly of this
'kingdom, that has been ſo often endangered by them.
'*May your Majeſty go on and extend your favour to all your*
'*ſubjects till none are excluded from ſo great a bleſſing*, but
'ſuch as by their own frowardneſs or diſaffection to
'the public good bar themſelves from the general advan-
'tages of your Majeſty's reign §.'

The Queen's anſwer to the Commons was in theſe very general and evaſive terms: 'The Commons may be
'aſſured, that nothing ſhall be wanting on her part to
'make the Union of all her ſubjects as extenſive as is
'poſſible ‖.' And although in their new addreſs of thanks for this anſwer they ſeem to have been deſirous to give it an interpretation applicable to the meaſure they had in contemplation, declaring that 'The aſſurance

‡ Journals of the Iriſh Commons, vol. iii. p. 368.
§ 15th July 1707, Journals of Iriſh Lords, vol. ii. p. 161.
30th July 1707, Journals of Iriſh Commons, vol. iii. p. 420.

'her Majeſty had been pleaſed to give them, had inſpired 'them with hopes of *an addition* to the many bleſſings they 'enjoyed under her moſt auſpicious reign *;' yet no real encouragement being given to their overtures on the ſubject, the matter was proſecuted no farther. The whole of the anſwer to the addreſs of the Lords was in theſe formal, cold, and diſheartening words: 'Her Majeſty returns 'their Lordſhips her hearty thanks for their addreſs, and 'is very ſenſible of their zeal for hers and the public 'ſervice. Her Majeſty is alſo very well pleaſed with 'the ſatisfaction their Lordſhips expreſs in her endea-'vours to unite all her ſubjects †.'

The Engliſh Government and the Iriſh Parliament had one very natural ſentiment in common, the apprehenſion of danger from the great number of Catholics in Ireland, who continued attached to a dethroned monarch of the ſame religion with themſelves. But the Parliament ſeems to have looked to a legiſlative Union as the ſureſt protection againſt this danger. The Miniſters in England preferred the eſtabliſhment of a ſyſtem of ſevere penalties and diſqualifications againſt Papiſts, reſtrictive of the rights, as well civil as political, which, till then, they had enjoyed in that country equally with their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects. And the attempt to engage the Queen in the meaſure they had recommended having failed, the Parliament, ſeeing no third courſe, thought themſelves compelled to co-operate with the Crown in adopting the other expedient. It has, accordingly, been truly remarked by a great authority in the ſiſter kingdom, 'That it was not till the propoſition to unite the Le-

* 31ſt July 1707, Journals of Iriſh Commons, vol. iii. p. 431.

† Journals of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, 4th Auguſt 1707, vol. ii. p. 189.

'giſlatures

' giſlatures of the two countries had proved abortive, that ' the great code of the popery laws of Ireland was ' enacted ‡.'

I do not find the matter of Union to have been afterwards revived in the Iriſh Parliament, but it ſtill continued to be a very general and frequent ſubject of public diſcuſſion in both kingdoms.

In *Cato*'s Letters, a work, I believe, of univerſal circulation about the middle of the enſuing reign, Mr. *Trenchard*, who was peculiarly verſed in the concerns of Ireland, recommended it in the following terms, which conclude one of the letters in that collection written by him, and entitled, ' On Plantations and Colonies:' ' Ireland is too powerful to be treated only as a colony. ' *If we deſign to continue them friends*, the beſt way to do it ' is to imitate the example of merchants and ſhopkeepers; ' that is, when their apprentices are acquainted with ' their trade, and out of their time, to take them into ' partnerſhip rather than let them *ſet up for themſelves* ' in the neighbourhood §.'

It is very clear that neither he nor any of the earlier writers I have quoted, ever imagined there could be any difficulty or objection raiſed on the part of Ireland.

In the reign of George the IId, about the year 1735, the excellent *Berkeley*, a moſt impartial and enlightened patriot, publiſhed a book on the intereſts of Ireland, called ' *The Queriſt*,' from many paſſages in which he

‡ Lord *Fitzgibbon*'s Speech in the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, 13th March 1793, Iriſh edition, p. 16.

§ *Cato*'s Letters, 3d edition, vol. iv. Letter I. p. 12.

appears

appears to have had the expediency of a Union, for the advantage both of his native country and this, ſtrongly impreſſed on his mind. In the 90th query particularly, he thus expreſſes himſelf: 'Qu. Whether if it be not the 'true intereſt of both nations to become *one people*, and 'whether either be ſufficiently appriſed of this?'

Dean *Tucker*'s propoſal for 'A Union with Ireland,' was firſt printed, I believe, in the year 1751, in his 'Eſſay on Trade *;' a work as generally read and ſtudied in Ireland as Great Britain.

In the year following (1752) a tract appeared under the title of 'A Propoſal for uniting the Kingdoms of Great 'Britain and Ireland,' which was generally underſtood to be the production of a reſpectable Nobleman of the ſiſter kingdom, to whom I have before alluded, the late Marquis of *Downſhire;* and if I am not much miſinformed, this meaſure now under conſideration, *viz.* a legiſlative incorporation, which it was the object of that publication to recommend, was, during the whole of his life, a favourite object with that experienced ſtateſman, a frequent ſubject of his converſation and diſcuſſion in both kingdoms, and ſtrongly recommended by him at different times to the different perſons ſucceſſively at the head of Government.

Sir, I truſt the ſelection I have made, which, though a ſmall part of what might have been ſtated, may, I fear, have appeared tedious to the Houſe, has fully proved my aſſertion, that this ſubject has not come on the ſudden, and by ſurpriſe, on the people and Parliament of Ireland.

* Propoſal 3d and 4th.

Indeed

Indeed Mr. *Burke* (whoſe name I cannot pronounce without reverence and affection) tells us, in his Letter to Sir *Hercules Langriſhe*, 'that he had heard a diſcuſſion 'concerning an Union amongſt all ſorts of men ever ſince 'he remembered any thing *.'

I wiſh I could have added that great man to the liſt of thoſe, both in Ireland and here, who have been decided advocates for the meaſure; but leſt he ſhould be ſuppoſed to have been decidedly of a contrary opinion, I will ſubjoin the candid language in which he goes on in the ſame paſſage to expreſs himſelf concerning it:

'For my own part,' ſays he, 'I have never been able to 'bring my mind to any thing clear and deciſive on the 'ſubject; there cannot be a more arduous queſtion. As 'far as I can form an opinion, it would not be for the 'mutual advantage of both kingdoms; but perſons more 'able than I am think otherwiſe. But whatever the merits 'of this Union may be, to make it a menace it muſt be 'ſhown to be an evil, and an evil more particularly 'to thoſe who are threatened with it, than to thoſe who 'throw it out as a terror. I really do not ſee how this 'threat can operate, or that the Catholics are more 'likely to be loſers than the Churchmen †.'

It cannot have eſcaped the attention of the Houſe, that none of thoſe of whom I have made mention, neither Sir *William Petty*, the Iriſh Council of Trade, the two Houſes of that Parliament in 1703 and 1707, nor Mr. *Trenchard*, Biſhop *Berkeley*, Dean *Tucker*, Lord *Downſhire*, or Mr. *Burke*, ever ſeem to have entertained a

* Second edition, p. 75. † Ibid.

ſuſpicion

ſuſpicion of that new diſcovery—the incompetency of the Iriſh Parliament.

What has been ſtated to ſhow the long and continued attention which muſt have been given to the ſubject in Ireland, goes a great way alſo to prove, that there muſt always have been a great number of perſons there, in that ſphere of life in which alone men are to be found in any country capable of underſtanding and judging of ſuch matters, who were ſtrongly of opinion, that a legiſlative Union would be of the utmoſt benefit to theirs.

It has, however, been very confidently averred, that the Iriſh in general have always been averſe to a Union; inſomuch that whenever it has been an object there to render a new Lord Lieutenant unpopular, it has been cuſtomary to give out, as a watchword, that he had been ſent over for the purpoſe of effecting that meaſure. I know, Sir, that the art of running down a Lord Lieutenant in former times has been carried to a great degree of perfection in that kingdom, and perhaps it may not yet have fallen into abſolute diſuſe. But is it thought that ſuch a '*politic trick*' (as *De Foe* expreſſes himſelf on a ſimilar ſubject) furniſhes a very ſerious proof of the diſinclination of the majority of that nation to the meaſure? Will thoſe who reaſon in this way deny, that there have been times, and thoſe not very remote, when a cry that the object of a Chief Governor's miſſion was what is called 'Catholic emancipation,' would have been no ineffectual means of exciting the mob of Dublin againſt him, perhaps of embarraſſing or overawing his government? Friends as they are to the admiſſion of the Catholics to an equal participation of political rights, will they conſent to a ſimilar argument being built againſt that

favourite object of theirs on such a circumstance? The truth is, catchwords and quaint abstractions have a wonderful effect sometimes on that multitude; 'Protestant 'ascendancy,' and 'Catholic emancipation,' have each had their day,—both, I believe, coined in the same mint. 'Parliamentary incompetency' may, perhaps, be the favourite at present; but that phrase has too little singularity of diction, and is too plain, as well as too obviously false in its meaning, to have a very long reign.

In fact, however, when artful people have chosen to raise an alarm, or excite prejudices in Ireland against a Union, they have not satisfied themselves with a vague and general description of it; they have accompanied that term with explanations naturally and justly tending to render the measure offensive and obnoxious to the nation. Do we find, when the Council of Trade and the Parliament, when *Molyneux*, and *Berkeley*, and Lord *Hillsborough* recommended it, that they lost the good-will of their country? But when, as in 1759, on an occasion, an account of which has been quoted from the Annual Register of that year*, the Union supposed to be in contemplation, has been represented as a measure intended to subject the Irish nation '*to the same taxes with Eng-*'*land*;' when it has been represented, to use the language imputed to a learned Gentleman formerly a member of that Parliament, 'that a Union would be *the par-*'*ticipation of British taxes without British trade*, and ren-'der the kingdom of Ireland a wretched colony, govern-'ed by a few excisemen†;' one does not wonder that with such comments, the indignation of the populace

* Vol. ii. p. 129.

† Irish Parliamentary Debates, vol. xii. p. 177, 178.

ſhould have been raiſed againſt it; though every body muſt diſapprove of the diſorderly violence by which they were prompted, in 1759, to break into the Houſe of Lords, and commit that ſort of groſs and indecent inſult towards the Throne which has been mentioned, and which another Dublin mob, on a more recent and leſs excuſable occaſion, is ſaid to have practiſed towards the Chair of the Houſe of Commons.

As to the ſuppoſition of a univerſality of ſentiment at preſent manifeſted in Ireland againſt the Union, I muſt not expect that Gentlemen on the other ſide will pay the attention I think they deſerve to my reaſons for diſſenting from it, eſpecially as it was two months ago * affirmed in this place, that there were then authentic documents arrived to prove the fact. According to my information, however, at that time only certain meetings in Dublin and its neighbourhood, and in a few of the counties in Leinſter, had declared any ſuch opinion; Cork had addreſſed his Majeſty in favour of a Union, and if I have not been greatly deceived, pretty active endeavours had been uſed, but, up to that time at leaſt, in vain, to procure addreſſes and reſolutions againſt it from various reſpectable counties in the north, the weſt, and the ſouth. Since then, indeed, new addreſſers and reſolvers have appeared, but we have alſo ſeen various counter-reſolutions. Thoſe of the Grand Juries of the firſt city in magnitude and opulence next to Dublin, and of the firſt county, that of Cork, are particularly to be diſtinguiſhed.

Sir, I ſhould be one of the laſt to treat with neglect the real ſenſe of the nation on this or any ſub-

* 11th February.

ject; but which on this, as it ſhall be expreſſed by the ſuffrages of its repreſentatives, muſt ultimately decide the queſtion; or to ſay, that even through ſuch irregular and uncertain organs as county or corporation meetings, the voice of the people is not worthy of the moſt ſerious attention. Yet when I look back on the hiſtory of this country for the laſt century and a half, and on that of France for the laſt *decade* of years, as I ſuppoſe I ought to call it; when I call to mind the addreſſes to *Richard Cromwell* on his ſucceſſion to the Protectorate, thoſe in Scotland againſt the Union of 1707, and thoſe in France calumniating the virtuous and ſaint-like *Lewis* XVI. as a tyrant, and extolling the bloody *Robeſpierre* and his aſſociates as the ſaviours of their country; I muſt be pardoned if I cannot conſider ſuch acts and inſtruments, however numerous, and whatever reſpectable names may be found among the ſubſcriptions to them, as very certain teſts of national opinion. Much leſs as unchangeable teſts; for, ſatisfied as I am of the importance and even neceſſity of this meaſure for the ſafety of Ireland, I will not think ſo ill of one of the moſt intelligent as well as moſt liberal-minded nations that exiſts, though withal, at times, ſomewhat haſty and irritable, as not to believe, when the arts that have been employed to excite their jealouſy and alarm their honourable pride ſhall have been detected, and the illuſions of that ſophiſtry, which has very unfortunately been taken for ſound argument by a few able men among them, (for what abilities are proof againſt prejudice and prepoſſeſſion?) and has been dreſſed up with all the ſkill and talents they poſſeſs, to be circulated among the people at large, ſhall have vaniſhed in the hour of ſober judgment and reflection; that the great majority of the preſent opponents will change their ſentiments, and feel the truth of the old adage, that ſecond

thoughts, in matters of ſuch moment, are generally the beſt.

This the Scotch nation have fully experienced by the bleſſings they have derived from the Union of 1707, at firſt ſo ſtrongly oppoſed by ſo many people of every claſs and deſcription in the country. That this was the caſe is as clear, I believe, as any hiſtorical fact whatever; and therefore it has ſeemed very ſtrange to me to hear the reſiſtance made in Scotland at that time, treated by ſome Gentlemen as having been ſlight and inſignificant in compariſon to the oppoſition now exiſting in Ireland to the Union between that country and this; and the meaſure repreſented in truth to have been the general wiſh and deſire of the whole nation. Indeed, Sir, miſtaken notions of the dignity and advantage of a ſeparate and independent Legiſlature, excluſively their own, having exiſted among the Scotch, from the firſt junction of the two Crowns, in at leaſt as exalted a degree as that to which they are now carried in Ireland, I do not underſtand upon what evidence it is alleged that, even at that early period, that nation was anxious for a complete *legiſlative incorporation* with their ſouthern neighbours. James I. who had become the common Sovereign of both, might deſire it. He was certainly deſirous of a ſtricter Union than the mere deſcent of the Engliſh monarchy upon him had produced. And a *legiſlative Union* was undoubtedly in the contemplation of ſome of the great ſtateſmen, with whom he ſeems chiefly to have conſulted on the ſubject, particularly Sir Francis Bacon. But, from a conſideration of the articles agreed to in Scotland on that occaſion, it will be found, that the actual treaty which became the ſubject of negotiation was only of a federal and commercial kind, and intended to eſta-

 bliſh

bliſh an equal communication of civil and perſonal rights; but not to incorporate the Parliaments: and the Parliament of that country expreſsly declared, during the progreſs of the buſineſs, *'that the kingdom ſhould remain 'an abſolute and free monarchy*.'

When, after the Reſtoration, in 1670, the Commiſſioners for both kingdoms came to treat for an efficient incorporation of the two Legiſlatures, though the Scotch ſhowed themſelves perfectly well inclined to the general propoſition, yet, by inſiſting on terms to which they muſt have been ſure England could never agree, namely, that the whole body of the Scotch Parliament, the full number of their Peers and Commoners, ſhould be joined to thoſe of England†; they ſeem to me to have proved very clearly that they were not diſpoſed to negotiate upon any practicable or admiſſible conditions. Accordingly, at that time, the affair went off in truth on the part of Scotland.

But to come to the treaty which was carried into effect. That the great majority of the truly wiſe and ſober men of the country, the real patriots and genuine ſtateſmen, and I would add too, the men of the trueſt and moſt elevated and enlightened ambition, earneſtly wiſhed for it, and were vigilant in ſeizing every occaſion and circumſtance which could tend to its completion, I moſt readily allow. But that the factious, the ſeditious, and the rebellious, that many not obnoxious to ſuch charges, but who had either confined their views to that limited ſphere of action, or, like the celebrated *Fletcher*, poſſeſſing great and cultivated minds, had heated

* *Spaniſh Monde*, p. 503.

† 1ſt November 1670. *De Foe*, p. 61.

their

their imaginations with notions of government incompatible with the ancient inſtitutions of their country, or any form which an incorporation of the two exiſting conſtitutions could aſſume, but which, from the peculiarly diſordered ſtate of Scotland at the time—chimerical as they were—they vainly hoped they might ſee realized; that all thoſe and various other claſſes of men, forming, perhaps, a majority of the whole, reckoning by tale inſtead of weight, by numbers inſtead of property, were the declared and active enemies of the Union, is, I believe, as certain, as it is, that, by virtue of the manly and ſteady diſregard with which the Adminiſtration of that day treated their hoſtility and violence, one of the moſt important and fortunate political tranſactions recorded in the annals of the world, was brought to a happy concluſion. I would recommend to any man who really has doubts on this point, the re-peruſal and compariſon of the contemporary authors who have written on the ſubject, particularly the two moſt remarkable among them, *De Foe* the able hiſtorian and advocate, and *Lockhart* the defamer and libeller, of the Union.

Permit me to read a paſſage from another writer of the time, Biſhop *Burnet*, as the matter of it, I think, gives us ſtrong encouragement to cheriſh the moſt favourable proſpect of the iſſue of the preſent ſtill more important meaſure.

'The Union,' ſays he, 'of the two kingdoms was 'a work of which many had deſpaired, in which num-'ber I was one; and thoſe who entertained better hopes, 'thought it muſt have run out into a long negotiation for 'ſeveral years; but, beyond all men's expectation, it 'was begun and finiſhed within the compaſs of one.

'The

'The body of the people ſhowed ſo much ſullenneſs, that 'probably, had any perſon of authority once kindled the 'flame, they ſeemed of ſuch combuſtible matter, that 'the Union might have caſt that nation into great con-'vulſions. The Duke of *Queenſberry* deſpaired of ſucceed-'ing, and one about him wrote to the Lord Treaſurer 'reſpecting the ill-temper the nation was *generally* in, 'and moving for an adjournment, that ſo, with the help 'of time and good management, thoſe difficulties, which 'ſeemed then inſuperable, might be conquered *.' He adds, 'the Lord Treaſurer told me his anſwer was—'that a delay was, upon the matter, laying the whole 'deſign aſide †.'

Nay, Sir, in the Houſe of Lords, when the treaty came to be debated there, Lord *Haverſham* appears expreſsly to have ſtated, and without being contradicted by any body, 'That though the articles of Union were ra-'tified by the Scotch Parliament, yet the bulk and body 'of that nation ſeemed to be againſt it. Have not,' he ſaid, 'the murmurs of the people there been ſo loud as 'to fill the whole nation, and ſo bold too as to reach even 'to the doors of the Parliament? Has not the Parlia-'ment itſelf thought fit to ſuſpend their beloved clauſe 'in their act of ſecurity, for arming their people, during 'the ſeſſion? Nay, has not the Government, by advice 'of Parliament, iſſued a proclamation, pardoning all 'ſlaughter, bloodſhed, maiming, &c. that is committed 'upon any who are found in any tumults there? I do not 'mention this to find fault with any thing done in Scot-'land, but only to ſhow to your Lordſhips, that where 'ſuch an unuſual proclamation as this is ſet out by the

* *Burnet*'s Hiſtory of his own Times, vol. ii. p. 462.

† Ibid.

'advice

'advice of Parliament, and cannot ſtay for the forms of 'a law; when we know that, on extraordinary occaſions, 'a bill may be read three times in a day; ſure, my Lords, 'it ſhows a very great ferment, that requires ſo very 'ſpeedy an application *.'

To an infinity of evidence of this contemporaneous ſort, might be added the reſult of that evidence as it has been collected by every hiſtorian who has written on the ſubject in later times, but I will only mention a ſhort ſentence or two from one who, in declaring his opinion of the advantages the Union has produced to both countries, but eſpecially to Scotland, expreſſes himſelf in the following ſtrong and glowing language: 'The 'Union of the two kingdoms, into which the Engliſh 'entered with ſo much facility, and the *Scotch with ſo much 'reluctance*, was yet of infinitely higher advantage to the 'latter than the former. An inſeparable connexion was 'thereby formed between them, by which Scotland was 'to experience and augment the happineſs, the glory, and 'the ſtability of England. They were to be conſtant 'companions in proſperity and misfortune; and if England 'is ever to periſh like Carthage, Sparta, and Rome, 'its ſiſter nation will prolong the ſtruggle, hold the for-'tunes of the victor in ſuſpenſe, and exert, in extinction 'and death, that elevation of character, and that diſdain 'of a maſter, which diſtinguiſh and ennoble the revolu-'tions of her hiſtory †.'

We have been told that a majority of each of the three claſſes who compoſed the Parliament of Scotland voted for the Union. They did ſo; but it is remarkable, if you

* Continuation of Rapin, vol. xvi. p. 365.

† *Stuart*'s Hiſtory of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 56.

take

take each of thoſe three claſſes, which were called Eſtates, ſeparately, and ſuppoſe the concurrence of a majority of each neceſſary, which perhaps it was*, that in each of the two Eſtates of commoners that majority was but four, the reſt of the total majority of thirty-three being compoſed of twenty-five noblemen. On the other hand, if you ſuppoſe an abſolute majority *per capita* to have been all that was requiſite, then that total majority fell ſhort by four of the aggregate number of the votes in favour of Union on the diviſions in the two Iriſh Houſes taken together, on the 22d of January laſt, the firſt day the matter was agitated there †.

It has been ſtated in this place, in the very face of the proof I have mentioned, and the known facts to which I have referred, that the number of addreſſes and addreſſers in Scotland againſt the meaſure was comparatively ſmall, and the ſymptoms of active oppoſition out of the Parliament ſcarcely any. How muſt the diligent and accurate ſpirit of inveſtigation, which belongs to thoſe who made that aſſertion, have deſerted them in their inquiries on this occaſion? Otherwiſe, could they have overlooked the vaſt number of thoſe addreſſes, amounting to between 80 and 90‡ (while thoſe againſt the commercial propoſitions in 1785, which were thought ſo numerous and proved ſo formidable, were in all but 62 §), and the extenſive and diverſified deſcription of the parties ſubſcribing; barons, heritors, and freeholders of, I believe,

* Supra, p. 117.

† In the Houſe of Lords, on the diviſion on Lord *Bellamont*'s Amendment, the majority for the Union was 36, the numbers being 52 to 16.

‡ According to *De Foe* (p. 329 to 457), juſt 85.

§ Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. xviii. p. 212.

every county but one in that kingdom, burgeſſes of almoſt every borough, ſynods, preſbyteries, and pariſhes, in every diſtrict of the country? In ſhort, they were ſo numerous, and ſo various, that it was not without colour, that in a famous proteſt, prepared by the oppoſition of that day, it was aſſerted, 'That the 'ſubjects of this nation of all ranks and qualities have 'generally ſhown an utter averſion to any ſuch Union 'as is contained in the articles now lying before the 'Houſe ‡.'

Then, Sir, as to the activity of the oppoſition without doors, have the accounts; contained in the authors I have quoted, in *Burnet*, *Lockhart*, and *De Foe*; entirely eſcaped thoſe gentlemen; of the riots at Edinburgh, the inſurrection at Glaſgow, the army of 7000 men in the Weſt, ready and on the wing to advance to the Capital and diſperſe the Parliament §? Thank God, we have ſeen nothing of any attempt towards ſuch treaſonable methods of controlling the deliberations of the Iriſh Legiſlature on this occaſion.

Is it worth while to anſwer the obſervation, that the addreſſes were in general (they were not all ſo) againſt *the terms of the Union contained in the articles?* Surely, it cannot be imagined, or at leaſt till lately it could not have been imagined, that many perſons would have been found to join in objecting to entertain or deliberate upon a mere general propoſition of Union undefined by any ſpecific terms whatever. But it is well known that the framers and inſtigators of thoſe addreſſes objected princi-

‡ *Lockhart*, p. 298. § Ibid. p. 283.

pally

pally to that *eſſential part* of the articles, the incorporation of the Legiſlatures.

It is therefore clear that a much ſtronger prejudice, a much more violent ſpirit, diſcovered themſelves againſt the Scotch Union than it has been poſſible to excite in Ireland on the preſent occaſion. The ſame prejudice certainly continued for a few years afterwards, fomented by the partiſans of the exiled family, on the one hand, and all who wiſhed to thwart the exiſting adminiſtration, on the other; and this prejudice, no doubt, contributed very much to increaſe the temporary infatuation of the Scotch Lords in 1713, who, on the occaſion of the malt-tax I mentioned ſome time ago, moved for the diſſolution of the Union.

But the good ſenſe of that nation, and their early feeling of the benefits daily accruing to them from the meaſure, ſoon appear to have made converts, even of the ſtill numerous claſs of adherents to James. A moſt ſtriking fact in proof of this was mentioned in a former debate by my Right Honourable Friend the Secretary of State. He did not think it neceſſary to ſtate authorities for a circumſtance ſo well known to many perſons converſant in the events of thoſe times; but from his not having done ſo, occaſion was taken to ſuggeſt a doubt concerning it ‖.

A few words will take away every pretext for any ſuch doubt. The fact ſtated was, that the Pretender in 1715, two years only after the affair of the malt, knowing the reſiſtance to the Union which had been ſo very general throughout Scotland at the time it was in agitation, had,

‖ 7th February. Parliamentary Regiſter, vol. vii. p. 734.

in the manifeſto he was about to iſſue, declared his purpoſe to be that it ſhould be diſſolved, but that upon better inquiry he diſcovered that the country had already become ſo ſenſible of its beneficial conſequences, that ſuch a declaration would injure his cauſe, and that he had therefore altered his deſign, and omitted the intended clauſe in his proclamation.

Now, Sir, this fact, beſides other proof, is completely eſtabliſhed by an extract lately printed in Dr. *Somerville's* Hiſtory of Queen Anne from the manuſcript Memorials of Sir *John Clerk*, a gentleman of character and eminence in the beginning of the century, member of the laſt Parliament of Scotland, and who was much in the confidence of the principal perſons concerned in Scotch affairs at the time of the Union and for many years afterwards. Thoſe Memorials were written freſh as the events occurred, for the uſe and inſtruction of his own family. The words of the manuſcript are theſe: 'The Scots were ſo ſenſible of the benefit of the Union, that at the 'time of the rebellion, in 1715, the Pretender was 'obliged to alter that part of his proclamation which pro-'miſed to repeal the Union, and to expreſs his determi-'nation to leave it to the deciſion of Parliament *.'

The apprehenſions of inconvenience to Great Britain which I have heard ſtated, have been, 1ſt, removal of capital; 2d, the increaſed numbers in the Houſe of Commons; 3d, ſome ſuppoſed incongruity between the national habits and character of the people of Ireland

* *Somerville's* Hiſtory of Queen Anne, p. 228. Note 4.

and of thoſe of this country, which may occaſion an injurious change in the character, modes, and principles of deliberation and deciſion of our Legiſlature. To theſe I may add an objection which is of a general nature, and not applicable more to the caſe of the one country than to that of the other; viz. 4th, that a Union on the baſis of the Reſolutions now before us will be imperfect.

1. As to the removal of capital, I will only ſay a ſingle word or two, in addition to what I have already very ſhortly obſerved on that ſubject *; namely, that if there is, in the overflowing capital of this country, a great deal beyond what is engaged in its commerce and agriculture, that ſurplus cannot be more advantageouſly laid out for Great Britain than by the employment of it in what will then make a part of one and the ſame kingdom. We are indeed told, 'that the capital of 'England is ſo fully employed, that there is none to 'ſpare †.' But I know not how that opinion is to be reconciled to the eagerneſs with which, to this moment, we ſee men ready to engage large ſums in every new ſpeculation affording a reaſonable proſpect of ſecurity for their principal, though with a very moderate intereſt upon it—many people of late, to a great extent of adventure, running the hazard of failure altogether, and yet agreeing to confine their returns, whatever may be the ſucceſs of the undertaking, within the narroweſt limits of what is uſually conſidered as fair mercantile profit, many to 10 ‡, ſome even to 5, per cent. How

* Supra, p. 31, 32.

† Mr. *Foſter*'s Speech, p. 86.

‡ Ten per cent. is the dividend to which, I believe, Parliament has of late confined moſt of thoſe enterpriſes to which its ſanction has been given.

is

is it to be reconciled to the daily inveſtments of large ſums in the ſtocks, while the dividends amount to little more than 5 per cent. §? or to the known fact, that an immenſe proportion of the trade of many parts of the continent, I fear no inconſiderable ſhare of that of the enemy, is carried on with Britiſh capital; not to mention what, even under the preſent forbidding circumſtances, is engaged in the commerce of Ireland itſelf ||?

2. Some Gentlemen dread the acceſſion of a hundred members (I ſpeak, as they did, hypothetically) to the Britiſh Parliament. This, it is thought, may change the caſt and quality of this Houſe as a public aſſembly, and render it too popular and tumultuous.

Sir, I will not deny that I have felt ſome difficulty on this part of the ſubject. Indeed I ſhould be aſhamed to diſſemble any objection which may have weighed with me, in a caſe where I look upon it as a duty,—it is ſo, undoubtedly, in all deliberations here,—but in a peculiar degree as a duty, to examine the queſtion, not as an advocate, and for defence, but, as far as I am capable, as a judge who is, in his ſhare and proportion, to decide upon it.

But, Sir, I have conſidered, on the other hand, that this, at moſt, is but a conjectural diſadvantage, and of a very ſecondary ſort at all events, when balanced againſt

§ They now fall ſhort of it.

|| I believe the commerce of Ireland has always been carried on in a very conſiderable proportion with Engliſh capital. Sir *William Petty*, in the laſt century, ſaid, 'The ſtock which drives the 'foreign trade of Ireland doth near half of it belong to thoſe who 'live out of Ireland.' Political Anatomy of Ireland, p. 90.

the

the calamity of ſeparation, which I think I ſee is already put into the oppoſite ſcale.

I have alſo recollected, that by the original principle of our conſtitution, the Crown, and of courſe the Engliſh Parliament, could increaſe, without any fixed limitation, the number of repreſentative members; that in the reigns of Henry the Eighth and his deſcendants, this prerogative was exerciſed to a great extent and without inconvenience—I may ſay to the improvement of this branch of the Legiſlature; that the ſame power continued to exiſt till the Union with Scotland, in which country it alſo obtained, and had been exerciſed from time to time *; that in like manner the incorporation on that occaſion of forty-five new members with the former number in England has produced no ſuch inconvenience as is ſuggeſted; and laſtly, that I have not obſerved or heard that the great and frequent fluctuation in the attendance here from under a hundred to perhaps five hundred and upwards, has been the cauſe of any eſſential diſtinction in the nature of parliamentary meaſures, conſidered in a conſtitutional view; for I do not think we are to be guided, in this part of the argument, by any conſideration of the effects of ſuch fluctuations, as to party, to points of a momentary nature, or to what are ſometimes called trials of ſtrength between individuals, or this and that claſs of men, on matters not of important conſequence to the ſtate and the community.

3. The next apprehenſion I am not ſure whether I rightly underſtand; but I think it was ſtated as if it were conceived that the habits and turn of the Iriſh Gentlemen

* Supra, p. 117.

who

who may be elected to the common Parliament, were likely to be such as to lower the standard, as it were, of British representation. I think it was said, that they are not of a substance and materials which can safely coalesce with this Parliament; that they would corrupt and contaminate the whole mass. Sir, I believe nobody imagined that in so liberal and respectable a quarter as that from whence this observation came, it was meant to express any sentiment derogatory to the general and natural disposition of the Irish nation. I presume the idea was, and such indeed was, I think, the effect of the language in which it was conveyed, that, partly from the imputed corruption of Irish politics, partly from the savage ignorance and barbarity of the lower orders of people there, partly from the inveteracy of religious animosity, it was too probable, that the generality of the persons returned for Ireland would bring with them modes of thinking and acting, less pure, less rational, less dispassionate, than those which this hypothesis seems to assume as prevailing in this kingdom.

But, Sir, however much disposed I feel myself to think with just respect of the virtue and understanding of British Legislators, I must beg leave to say, that if the Honourable Gentleman to whom I allude had been well acquainted, which he professed not to be, with that class of men in Ireland, from among whom the representatives would of course be for the most part selected, he could not have suffered so idle a suggestion to enter his mind. Vulgar prejudice and national complacency do, with the vulgar of all countries, establish a sort of general impression of inferiority in the moral and intellectual qualities of neighbouring nations. I trust the members of this House

are

are far beyond the reach of such impressions. For my part, I am well persuaded Ireland is likely to furnish at least her fair proportion of genuine worth and genuine wisdom to the common stock of the imperial Parliament; and that whatever defects may be supposed to belong to the modes and practice of legislation there, they arise from the nature of a local, as connected, in the manner I have endeavoured to explain, with an imperial Parliament, and are in no respect founded on any peculiar imperfection in the description of the individuals who compose it. It has been well and justly observed in this House, by one whose generous and elevated sentiments on this question stood in no need of the weight of his high character to impress them on our recollection, 'that the people of Ireland have not been less distin-'guished than those of Great Britain, in corresponding 'stations of life, for eloquence, for literary and scientific 'acquirements, and for those talents and exertions 'which have established the naval and military renown 'of the British empire.' They will not, on their more intimate connexion with the rest of that empire, forfeit the pledge and earnest they have thus given. Indeed, Sir, we have already had sufficient examples in this very place to warrant that expectation; for can Great Britain herself boast of many of her sons who have more illustrated this assembly than some of those natives of that country, who in our own days have sat in it, and who must already have occurred to the minds of all who hear me?

4. As to the objection that the Union, as propoſed, will be imperfect, and on that account not anſwer the ends intended, it was, I think, grounded chiefly on the diſtinction which will probably remain, and to which

ſome of the Reſolutions point, in the financial ſyſtems of the two countries. Sir, this very objection was made on the part of England, by ſome Noble Lords in the other Houſe, at the time of the Union with Scotland. When the Treaty came to be debated in the Houſe of Lords, Lord *Haverſham*, in the ſpeech I have already mentioned, ſaid, 'There is another reaſon why I am 'againſt this Union, becauſe I cannot think it an entire 'Union. The exempting articles, I mean the twen-'tieth, whereby heritable offices and ſuperiorities are 'reſerved; and alſo the one-and-twentieth, both which '*Oliver*, by an act of ſtate, was ſo wiſe as to aboliſh*; 'but eſpecially their act for ſecuring their preſbyterian 'church government and general aſſemblies, ſeem to 'me like thoſe little clouds in a warm calm ſummer's 'day, that are generally the ſeeds and attractives of 'approaching tempeſt and thunder †.' This was one of thoſe many prophecies which in the event have fortunately not been accompliſhed. Yet the differences which were allowed to continue and ſtill remain between

* The wiſdom and policy of aboliſhing the heritable juriſdictions was in the contemplation of King James, even before his acceſſion to the Crown of England, as appears by the following remarkable paſſage in the book called Baſilicon Doron, addreſſed by him to his ſon Prince Henry: 'But the greateſt hinderance to 'the execution of our laws in this country are the heritable ſheriff-'doms and regalities, which, being in the hands of the great men, 'do rack the whole country. For which I know no preſent re-'medy, but by taking the ſharper account of them in their offices; 'uſing all puniſhment againſt the ſlothful that the law will per-'mit; and ever, as they become vacant for any offences committed, 'to diſpoſe them never heritably again; preſſing with time to 'draw it to the laudable cuſtom of England, which ye may the 'eaſilier do, being King of both, as I hope in God ye ſhall.' P. 48.

† Continuation of Rapin, vol. xvi. p. 33.

the

the local arrangements and inſtitutions in Scotland and England (ſeveral of them too, financial) were of much greater magnitude than any that are either propoſed to be maintained, or indeed, conſidering the much greater ſimilarity which already obtains, can exiſt after the Union with Ireland, between thoſe of this part of Great Britain and of that country.

I believe a perfect uniformity in all the branches and minute parts of the frame of government, never did take place as to all the different diſtricts and diviſions of the ſame country and nation, unleſs perhaps in ſome of thoſe diminutive ſovereignties which bear a nearer reſemblance to corporations and municipalities, than to ſuch ſtates as England and Ireland.

In France, under the monarchy, though the general outline and diſtinguiſhing features were in a great degree uniform throughout; yet there prevailed in the different provinces, *ſenechauſſées*, *balliages*, &c. of which that kingdom was compoſed, a remarkable diverſity in regard to many important particulars, ſuch as the rights of property real and moveable; the adminiſtration of juſtice; the impoſition and amount of taxes, and ſo forth; as to which, the different provinces with their ſubdiviſions, after their ſucceſſive incorporations with the kingdom at large, retained their ancient laws, uſages, and cuſtoms. The ſame obſervation is true of the other great ſtates of modern Europe, and will be found equally ſo in the inſtances of ſimilar incorporations, as far as they are known to have taken place in ancient Greece and Italy.

In England itſelf, the unity of the government has never been thought imperfect, becauſe of the different

rules of property, the different forms and courts of judicature, the different local cuſtoms and uſages, which obtain in the principality of Wales, in the duchy of Lancaſter, and in the various diſtricts, cities, boroughs, liberties, honours, and manors, throughout the kingdom.

On the acceſſion of James the VIth of Scotland to the throne of England, the Judges * gave it as their opinion that there could be no incorporating Union of the two kingdoms without an entire conformity of laws in both. Sir *Francis Bacon* was of a different ſentiment. He ſeems to have been ſtrongly convinced of the great inconvenience of the attempt to eſtabliſh ſo ſtrict a uniformity, and that it was by no means neceſſary. 'It is,' ſays he in his "Brief Diſcourſe, dedicated in private to his Majeſty," 'a matter of curioſity and inconveniency to ſeek either 'to extirpate all particular cuſtoms, or to draw all ſubjects to one reſort of judicature and ſeſſion; it ſufficeth 'there be uniformity in the principal and fundamental 'laws both eccleſiaſtical and civil †.' Even with regard to manners he obſerves, 'that a conſent in them is to be 'ſought indeed induſtriouſly, but not forced; for that 'nothing among people breeds ſo much pertinacity in 'holding their cuſtoms as ſudden and violent offers to 'remove them ‡.' And in another tract, ſtated 'to 'have been diſperſed for his Majeſty's ſervice,' after ſome argument to ſhow the difficulty of compoſing a general and uniform code for the two kingdoms, he concludes, 'that ſuch a general code would be too great a work to 'embrace §.'

* Co. 4 Inſt. c. 75. p. 347.
† *Bacon*'s Works, vol. ii. p. 157.
‡ Ibid. § Ibid. p. 167.

According

According to the judicious reflection of a modern author, 'Experience has now happily confirmed the juſt-'neſs of that great man's ſentiments, and both nations 'have reaſon to rejoice that the ſubtle reaſoning of the 'Judges met not with the ſame regard as on that occa-'ſion, in the reign of the great-grand-daughter of 'James.'

At that time, when the long-projected incorporation came to be carried into effect, it ſoon appeared that an endeavour at any ſuch conformity of laws would be attended with inſurmountable difficulties. Their ancient juriſprudence and tribunals were therefore, in general, preſerved to each country, and even a fundamental difference ſanctioned between the eccleſiaſtical laws and eſtabliſhments of the one and the other, which Lord *Bacon* ſeemed to think ſcarcely practicable.

It remains for me now, before I conclude, to ſay a very ſhort word or two of the two counter-projects which have been recommended to the Houſe.

The one is, a repeal, without condition or diſtinction, of all laws in both countries affecting Roman Catholics, and a free communication and permanent ſecurity of every branch of trade to the ſiſter kingdom. By theſe means, it is ſaid, you will produce the only deſirable Union between Great Britain and Ireland, the Union of hearts and affections.

As to the firſt part of this ſcheme, though I have declared my intention on this occaſion to avoid entering into the general merits of the Catholic queſtion, as it would

would ſtand on the ſuppoſition of a Union, I have no ſcruple to ſtate my concurrence with thoſe who think that an attempt to grant what is called Catholic emancipation, while the local Parliament remains, would excite ſuch a ſtruggle between property and numbers as would greatly aggravate many of thoſe miſchiefs which now exiſt in Ireland, tending to revolution and ſeparation, through the medium of a civil war of the moſt deſtructive and ferocious kind.

I have, in a former part of what I have ſaid, anticipated the anſwer to the commercial part of the propoſal, and ſhown, that if we were inclined, or it were right to grant every thing that may ſtill be wanting to an entirely free trade, we could not give permanent ſecurity to the grant otherwiſe than by Union.

With regard to the union of hearts and affections, I will not recur again to any diſcuſſion of that ſentimental kind of connexion of late ſo much talked of by perſons not apt to be led aſtray by a glare of words, but which, unleſs ariſing from one of a coarſer but more intelligible ſort; that which a permanent and unchangeable identity of intereſts and an indiſſoluble *conſpiratio et conſenſus partium* in the political machine have a neceſſary tendency to produce and perpetuate; is, in my judgment, mere idle and unprofitable declamation.

The other project is the reverſe of this; if I have underſtood it, it might be thus expreſſed: 'Beware of the 'Catholics of Ireland; tread back the raſh and incon- 'ſiderate ſteps you have taken in their favour; eraſe 'them again from the catalogue of electors, and re-enact 'againſt them that Popiſh code, the relaxations of

'which, at leaſt till the laſt in 1793, have been the uni-
'verſal boaſt and praiſe of his Majeſty's reign on both
'ſides of the channel: let there, however, be this modifi-
'cation in your proceeding, that although all Romaniſts,
'as they were called, ſhall be *primâ facie* conſidered as
'having, by their *preſumed* ſhare in the late conſpiracy
'and rebellion, forfeited all the privileges their ſect had
'recovered within the laſt twenty or thirty years;
'yet each individual among them may take upon himſelf
'the burden of proving his innocence of that charge;
'and, having eſtabliſhed it (a jury being ſummoned I
'ſuppoſe to try each particular caſe), he ſhall not only
'be reſtored to thoſe privileges, but ſhall, on ſuch pur-
'gation, be put individually into the poſſeſſion of every
'right belonging to Proteſtants.'

The hardſhip, cruelty, impolicy, and impracticability to any extent, of this ſcheme, I am ſatisfied did not, when it was thrown out, occur to the Hon. Propoſer in the forcible manner in which they muſt impreſs the minds of thoſe who have had occaſion to attend much to the late hiſtory and preſent condition of that kingdom. But the numberleſs difficulties which would belong to the execution of its detail, in eſtabliſhing again a religious and Proteſtant, not a geographical and Engliſh pale, and in ſeparating; man by man, as they ſhould preſent themſelves to the outlet of that ideal fold of penalties and diſabilities in which it is propoſed to encloſe and coop up the body of the Catholics; the innocent from the guilty, the ſheep from the goats, were pointed out in ſo clear a manner immediately after the plan was ſtated to the Houſe, that it would be in vain to attempt to add any thing to what was then ſaid.

Sir,

Sir, I am too ſenſible of the unuſual length of the intruſion I have been guilty of on the time and indulgence of the Houſe to continue it ſtill longer, by any other apology than this, that as it has certainly not been my habit often to trouble them, ſo it ſhall be my practice in future to avoid treſpaſſing on their patience, unleſs perhaps on ſome rare occaſions, like the preſent, where, being particularly led by a ſenſe of duty to the conſideration of any queſtion of importance, I may feel it to be an irreſiſtible part of that duty to ſubmit to them the grounds of my opinion, and the reaſons and motives for my vote.

APPEN-

APPENDIX.

No. I. Page 1.

1. *The King's Meſſage, preſented by Mr. Secretary Dundas, 22d January* 1799.

HIS Majeſty is perſuaded that the unremitting induſtry, with which our enemies perſevere in their avowed deſign of effecting the ſeparation of Ireland from this kingdom, cannot fail to engage the particular attention of Parliament, and his Majeſty recommends it to this Houſe to conſider of the moſt effectual means of counteracting, and finally defeating, this deſign; and he truſts that a review of all the circumſtances which have recently occurred (joined to the ſentiment of mutual affection and common intereſt) will diſpoſe the Parliaments of both kingdoms to provide, in the manner which they ſhall judge moſt expedient, for ſettling ſuch a complete and final adjuſtment as may beſt tend to improve and perpetuate a connexion eſſential for their common ſecurity, and to augment and conſolidate the ſtrength, power, and reſources of the Britiſh empire.

2. *Addreſs thereupon, preſented to his Majeſty, 24th January* 1799.

We your Majeſty's moſt dutiful and loyal ſubjects, the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament aſſembled, beg leave to return your Majeſty the thanks of this Houſe for your Majeſty's moſt gracious meſſage; and to aſſure your Majeſty, that, impreſſed with a deep ſenſe of the magnitude of the objects to which your Majeſty is pleaſed to direct our attention, and anxious at all times, and particularly at the preſent criſis, to avail ourſelves of every opportunity to improve and perpetuate the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland (ſo eſſential to their common ſecurity), and to promote the ſtrength and proſperity of every part of the Britiſh empire, we ſhall not fail to enter

on this conſideration with all due diſpatch, and with the diligence and attention which its tranſcendent importance demands.

3. *Reſolutions, as moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and voted in the Committee of the whole Houſe, 14th Feb. 1799.*

FIRST.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, in order to promote and ſecure the eſſential intereſts of Great Britain and Ireland, and to conſolidate the ſtrength, power, and reſources of the Britiſh empire, it will be adviſable to concur in ſuch meaſures as may beſt tend to unite the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland into one kingdom, in ſuch manner, and on ſuch terms and conditions, as may be eſtabliſhed by Acts of the reſpective Parliaments of his Majeſty's ſaid kingdoms.

SECOND.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That it would be fit to propoſe, as the firſt article, to ſerve as a baſis of the ſaid Union, that the ſaid kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland ſhall, upon a day to be agreed upon, be united into one kingdom, by the name of 'The United Kingdom of Great 'Britain and Ireland.'

THIRD.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that the ſucceſſion to the monarchy and the imperial crown of the ſaid United Kingdom ſhall continue limited and ſettled in the ſame manner as the imperial crown of the ſaid kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland now ſtands limited and ſettled, according to the exiſting laws, and to the terms of the Union between England and Scotland.

FOURTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that the ſaid United Kingdom be repreſented in one and the ſame Parliament, to be ſtyled 'The Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great 'Britain and Ireland;' and that ſuch a number of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and ſuch a number of Members in the Houſe of Commons, as ſhall be hereafter agreed upon by Acts of the reſpective Parliaments as aforeſaid, ſhall ſit and vote in the ſaid Parliament on the part of Ireland, and ſhall be ſummoned, choſen, and returned, in ſuch manner as ſhall be

fixed by an Act of Parliament of Ireland, previous to the ſaid Union; and that every Member, hereafter to ſit and vote in the ſaid Parliament of the United Kingdom, ſhall, until the ſaid Parliament ſhall otherwiſe provide, take and ſubſcribe the ſame oaths, and make the ſame declarations, as are by law required to be taken, ſubſcribed, and made, by the Members of the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland.

FIFTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that the churches of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline, and government thereof, ſhall be preſerved as now by law eſtabliſhed.

SIXTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that his Majeſty's ſubjects in Ireland ſhall, at all times hereafter, be entitled to the ſame privileges, and be on the ſame footing, in reſpect of trade and navigation, in all ports and places belonging to Great Britain, and in all caſes with reſpect to which treaties ſhall be made by his Majeſty, his heirs or ſucceſſors, with any foreign power, as his Majeſty's ſubjects in Great Britain:—That no duty ſhall be impoſed on the import or export between Great Britain and Ireland of any articles now duty-free; and that on other articles there ſhall be eſtabliſhed, for a time to be limited, ſuch a moderate rate of equal duties as ſhall, previous to the Union, be agreed upon and approved by the reſpective Parliaments; ſubject, after the expiration of ſuch limited time, to be diminiſhed equally with reſpect to both kingdoms, but in no caſe to be increaſed:—That all articles, which may at any time hereafter be imported into Great Britain from foreign parts, ſhall be importable through either kingdom into the other, ſubject to the like duties and regulations as if the ſame were imported directly from foreign parts:—That where any articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of either kingdom, are ſubject to any internal duty in one kingdom, ſuch countervailing duties (over and above any duties on import to be fixed as aforeſaid) ſhall be impoſed as ſhall be neceſſary to prevent any inequality in that reſpect:—And that all other matters of trade and commerce, other than the foregoing, and than ſuch others as may, before the Union, be ſpecially agreed upon for the due encouragement of the agriculture and manufactures of the reſpective kingdoms, ſhall remain to be regulated from time to time by the United Parliament.

SEVENTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that the charge ariſing from the payment of the intereſt, or ſinking fund for the reduction of the principal of the debt incurred in either kingdom before the Union, ſhall continue to be ſeparately defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland reſpectively:—That, for a number of years to be limited, the future ordinary expenſes of the United Kingdom, in peace or war, ſhall be defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland jointly, according to ſuch proportions as ſhall be eſtabliſhed by the reſpective Parliaments previous to the Union; and that, after the expiration of the time to be ſo limited, the proportion ſhall not be liable to be varied, except according to ſuch rules and principles as ſhall be in like manner agreed upon previous to the Union.

EIGHTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the ſame purpoſe, it would be fit to propoſe, that all laws in force at the time of the Union, and all the courts of civil or eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, within the reſpective kingdoms, ſhall remain, as now by law eſtabliſhed, within the ſame, ſubject only to ſuch alterations or regulations, from time to time, as circumſtances may appear, to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to require.

[*Note.* The firſt, ſecond, third, fourth, ſixth, and eighth, were agreed to by the Houſe without amendment.]

4. *The Fifth and Seventh Reſolutions, as amended in the Houſe.*

FIFTH.

That for the ſame purpoſe it would be fit to propoſe, that the churches of that part of Great Britain called England, and of that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and of Ireland, and the doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline, and government thereof, ſhall be preſerved as now by law eſtabliſhed.

SEVENTH.

That for the ſame purpoſe it would be fit to propoſe, that the charge ariſing from the payment of the intereſt, or ſinking fund for the reduction of the principal of the debt incurred in either kingdom before the Union, ſhall continue to be ſeparately paid by Great Britain and Ireland reſpectively:—That for a number of years to be limited, the future expenſes of the United Kingdom, in peace or war, ſhall be defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland jointly, according to ſuch proportions as

ſhall

ſhall be eſtabliſhed by the reſpective Parliaments previous to the Union; and that after the expiration of the time to be ſo limited, the mode of jointly defraying ſuch expenſes ſhall be regulated according to ſuch rules and principles as ſhall be in like manner agreed upon previous to the Union, for the purpoſe of eſtabliſhing gradually an uniform ſyſtem of taxation through every part of the United Kingdom.

5. *Addreſs, voted by the Houſe of Lords, and agreed to by the Commons, 22d April* 1799.

We, your Majeſty's moſt dutiful and loyal ſubjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament aſſembled, humbly beg leave to aſſure your Majeſty, that we have proceeded with the utmoſt attention to the conſideration of the important objects recommended to us in your Majeſty's Meſſage reſpecting the connexion between this country and Ireland.

We entertain a firm perſuaſion that a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal and liberal principles, on the ſimilarity of laws, conſtitution, and government, and on a ſenſe of mutual intereſts and affections, by promoting the ſecurity, wealth, and commerce of the reſpective kingdoms, and by allaying the diſtractions which have unhappily prevailed in Ireland, muſt afford freſh means of oppoſing at all times an effectual reſiſtance to the deſtructive projects of our foreign and domeſtic enemies, and muſt tend to confirm and augment the ſtability, power, and reſources of the empire.

Impreſſed with theſe conſiderations, we feel it our duty humbly to lay before your Majeſty ſuch propoſitions as appear to us beſt calculated to form the baſis of ſuch a ſettlement, leaving it to your Majeſty's wiſdom, at ſuch time and in ſuch manner as your Majeſty, in your parental ſolicitude for the happineſs of your people, ſhall judge fit, to communicate theſe propoſitions to your Parliament of Ireland, with whom we ſhall be at all times ready to concur in all ſuch meaſures as may be found moſt conducive to the accompliſhment of this great and ſalutary work. And we truſt that, after full and mature conſideration, ſuch a ſettlement may be framed and eſtabliſhed by the deliberative conſent of the Parliaments of both kingdoms, as may be conformable to the ſentiments, wiſhes, and real intereſts of your Majeſty's faithful ſubjects of Great Britain and Ireland, and may unite them inſeparably in the full enjoyment of the bleſſings of our free and invaluable conſtitution, in the ſupport of the honour and dignity of your Majeſty's Crown, and in the preſervation and advancement of the welfare and proſperity of the whole Britiſh empire.

6. *Extract*

6. *Extract from his Majesty's Speech, on the Prorogation of the Parliament, 12th July* 1799.

I have the satisfaction of seeing that internal tranquillity is in some degree restored in my kingdom of Ireland.

The removal of the only remaining naval force of the enemy to a distant quarter must nearly extinguish even the precarious hope which the traitorous and disaffected have entertained of foreign assistance.

But our great reliance for the immediate safety of that country must still rest on the experienced zeal and bravery of my troops of all descriptions, and on the unshaken loyalty and voluntary exertions of my faithful subjects in both kingdoms.

Its ultimate security can alone be ensured by its intimate and entire Union with Great Britain; and I am happy to observe, that the sentiments manifested by numerous and respectable descriptions of my Irish subjects justify the hope, that the accomplishment of this great and salutary work will be proved to be as much the joint wish, as it unquestionably is the common interest, of both my kingdoms.

No. II. Page 1.

1. *Extract from the Speech of the Marquis Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on the opening of the Session of the Irish Parliament, 22d January* 1799.

THE zeal of his Majesty's regular and militia forces, the gallantry of the yeomanry, the honourable co-operation of the British fencibles and militia, and the activity, skill, and valour of his Majesty's fleets, will, I doubt not, defeat every future effort of the enemy; but the more I have reflected on the situation and circumstances of this kingdom, considering on the one hand the strength and stability of Great Britain, and on the other those divisions which have shaken Ireland to its foundations, the more anxious I am for some permanent adjustment which may extend the advantages enjoyed by our sister kingdom to every part of this island.

The unremitting industry with which our enemies persevere in their avowed design of endeavouring to effect a separation of this kingdom from Great Britain must have engaged your particular attention, and his Majesty commands

me

me to expreſs his anxious hope, that this conſideration, joined to the ſentiment of mutual affection and common intereſt, may diſpoſe the Parliaments in both kingdoms to provide the moſt effectual means of maintaining and improving a connexion eſſential to their common ſecurity, and of conſolidating, as far as poſſible, into one firm and laſting fabric, the ſtrength, the power, and the reſources of the Britiſh empire.

2. *Paragraph in a Motion made the ſame Day, in the Houſe of Commons, for an Addreſs to the Crown.*

The unremitting activity with which our enemies perſevere in their avowed deſign of endeavouring to effect a ſeparation of this kingdom from Great Britain, muſt conſtantly engage our moſt earneſt attention; and as your Majeſty has condeſcended to expreſs an anxious hope that this circumſtance, joined to the ſentiment of mutual affection and common intereſt, may diſpoſe the Parliament in both kingdoms to provide the moſt effectual means of maintaining and improving a connexion eſſential to their common ſecurity, and of conſolidating, as far as poſſible, into one firm and laſting fabric, the ſtrength, the power, and the reſources of the Britiſh empire, we ſhall not fail to give the fulleſt conſideration to a communication of ſuch momentous importance.

3. *Amendment thereto, propoſed by Mr. Ponſonby, but rejected.*

A motion was made, and the queſtion being put, that an amendment be made in the foregoing motion by inſerting after the word *importance*, and before the word *to* in the ſame line, the following words, viz. 'but maintaining the undoubted birth-right of the people of Ireland to have a free and independent Legiſlature, reſident within this kingdom, as it was aſſerted by the Parliament of this kingdom in 1782, and acknowledged and ratified by his Majeſty and the Parliament of Great Britain upon the final adjuſtment of the diſcontents and jealouſies then prevailing among his Majeſty's loyal ſubjects of this country:'

It paſſed in the negative. Ayes 105.—Noes 106.

And then the queſtion being put on the original motion,

It was carried in the affirmative.

4. *Amendment thereto, adopted, 24th January 1799.*

The Addreſs having been prepared, and reported 24th January 1799, the above (2) forming the tenth paragraph,

The queſtion being put, that the ſaid paragraph ſtand part of the ſaid Addreſs,

It paſſed in the negative. Noes 109.—Ayes 104.

5. *Extract*

5. *Extract from the Lord Lieutenant's Speech, on the Prorogation of the Parliament, 1ſt June 1799.*

I have his Majeſty's particular commands to acquaint you that a joint Addreſs of the two Houſes of Parliament of Great Britain has been laid before his Majeſty, accompanied by Reſolutions propoſing and recommending a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, to be eſtabliſhed by the mutual conſent of both Parliaments, founded on equal and liberal principles, on the ſimilarity of laws, conſtitution, and government, and on a ſenſe of mutual intereſts and affections. His Majeſty will receive the greateſt ſatisfaction in witneſſing the accompliſhment of a ſyſtem, which, by allaying the unhappy diſtractions too long prevalent in Ireland, and by promoting the ſecurity, wealth, and commerce of his reſpective kingdoms, muſt afford them at all times, and eſpecially in the preſent moment, the beſt means of jointly oppoſing an effectual reſiſtance to the deſtructive projects of foreign and domeſtic enemies; and his Majeſty, as the common father of his people, muſt look forward with earneſt anxiety to the moment when, in conformity to the ſentiments, wiſhes, and real intereſts of his ſubjects of Great Britain and Ireland, they may all be inſeparably united in the full enjoyment of the bleſſings of a free conſtitution, in the ſupport of the honour and dignity of his Majeſty's Crown, and in the preſervation and advancement of the welfare and proſperity of the whole Britiſh empire.

I feel moſt ſenſibly the arduous ſituation in which I am placed, and the weight of the truſt which his Majeſty has impoſed upon me at this moſt important criſis; but if I ſhould be ſo fortunate as to contribute in the ſmalleſt degree to the ſucceſs of this great meaſure, I ſhall think the labours and anxiety of a life devoted to the ſervice of my country amply repaid, and ſhall retire with the conſcious ſatisfaction that I have had ſome ſhare in averting from his Majeſty's dominions thoſe dangers and calamities which have overſpread ſo large a portion of Europe.

No. III. Page 20.

1. *Extract from the Records of the Privy Council of Scotland.*

At Edinb. the eighth day of September, one thouſand ſeven hundred and two years.

Sederunt.

Lo. Chancelor,	E. Buchan,	Lo. Polwarth,
M. Lothian,	Viſ. Tarbat,	Lo. Advocat,
E. Crafurd,	Viſ. Roſbery,	Lo. Proveſt of Edin.
E. Marr,		

LETTER from the Queen to the Councill for calling and indicting a new Parliament read & order'd to be recorded, wherof the tenor followes.

Sic ſupra ſcribitur, Anne R.

'Right truſtie, &c. Wee greet yow well; Haveing upon 'weighty conſiderationes thought fitt to call a Parliament of that 'our ancient kingdome to meet at Edinburgh the twelth day of 'November nixt enſueing the date hereof; Wee have now ſent 'yow here incloſed a Proclamation to be iſſhued for that pur-'poſe; which yow are to take care to be timely publiſhed with 'all the ſolemnities uſuall upon the like occaſiones, for doeing 'wherof this ſhall be your warrant; and ſo Wee bid yow hear-'tily farewell. Given at our Court at Windſour Caſtle, the '25th day of Auguſt 1702, and of our rigne the firſt year. By 'her Majeſtie's command, *ſic ſubſcribitur*

'QUEENSBERRY.'

Proclamation under her Majeſtie's royall hand calling & indicting the ſaid new Parliament to meet at Edinburgh the twelth November nixt; and the ſamen being read in their preſence, the Councill ordained the ſaid Proclamation to be recorded, printed, and publiſhed, at the marcat croſs of Edinburgh, and at the marcat croſſes of the remanent head burghs of the ſeverall ſhyres & ſtewartries of this kingdome. And appoints her Majeſtie's Solicitors to tranſmit copies therof to the reſpective Shirriffs and Stewarts of this kingdome, to the effect they may conveen the free holders within ther reſpective bounds, & the magiſtrats of their reſpective burghs their toune councills, furth with to elect their reſpective Commiſſioners to the enſueing Parliament. Off the which Proclamation the tenor folloes.

'Anne, by the grace of God, Queen of Great Brittaine, 'France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. To all and 'ſundrie our good ſubjects whom theſe preſents doe or may

'concerne,

' concerne, greeting; Wheras the late Parliament of that our ' ancient kingdome is by our authority dissolved; and consider- ' ing that Wee are ingadged at present in a most just and neces- ' sary warr; and that by acts past in the Parliament both of ' Scotland and England Wee are impowered, & have accord- ' ingly nominat Commissioners to treat of an Union betwixt ' these our kingdomes, & of other things, matters, & causes, ' relateing therto; conforme to the tenors of the saids acts, the ' conclusion of which Union to be established and ratified in ' both Parliaments, will undoubtedly conduce to the lasting ' peace & wellfare of both kingdoms; for which causses, and ' that Wee judge it necessary ther should be a Parliament in being ' to meett on such occasiones as may requyre it, Wee have ther- ' fore thought fitt to call a Parliament of that our kingdome to ' meet at our city of Edinburgh upon the twelth day of Novem- ' ber nixt ensueing the date of these presents: Wee doe ther- ' fore requyre & command all Dukes, Marquesses, Earles, ' Viscounts, Lords, & Officers of State of our said kingdome, ' to be present & attend at that dyet; and Wee doe also re- ' quyre & command all our Shirriffs in the severall shyres & ' their deputes furth with to call & conveen all the freeholders ' in the respective shyres, to the end that according to the lawes ' & acts of Parliament, electiones may be made of fitt per- ' sones to be Commissioners for this Parliament. And Wee doe ' lykways requyre & command our royall burrowes to make ' choise of Commissioners accordingly; & them & all per- ' sones haveing intrest to attend this our Parliament under the ' paines contained in our lawes made theranent; and to the ' effect all our good subjects may have nottice of this our ' royall will & pleasure, Wee doe hereby command our Lyon ' King of Armes, & his bretheren Heraulds, Macers, Purse- ' vants & Messengers at Armes, to make timeous proclamatione ' of these presents at the marcat cross of Edinburgh, & at ' the marcat crosses of the head burghes of the severall shyres ' of that our ancient kingdome. Given at our Court at Wind- ' sour Castle, the 25th August 1702, & of our reigne the first ' year. By her Majestie, *sic subscribitur*

' QUEENSBERRY.'

2. *Commission by the Freeholders of Edinburghshire.*

' Be it knowen to all men by thir present letters, Wee the ' barrons & freeholders of the shereffdome of Edinburgh ' principall, being mett & conveened within the Parliament ' Howse therof, to the effect underwritten, be vertue of inti- ' matione and advertisement from the shireff principall and his ' deputts; and wee takeing to our consideratioune that the last ' Parliament is dissolved, and that ther is ane new Parliament in-

' dicted

'dicted by her Majeſty Queen Ann, to meet att Edinburgh on 'the twelth day of November nixt to come; and that it is 'neceſſar wee have four commiſſioners elected to repreſent this 'ſhyre in the ſaid Parliament, and ſeverall meetings and ſeſ-'ſiones therof; and wee being firſt qualified by ſwearing the 'oath of aledganes to her Majeſty Queen Ann, and ſubſcryve-'ing the ſame with the aſſurance; and haveing knawledge of 'the fidelitie, fittneſs, and abilitie of the perſones underwritten, 'to the effect aftermentionat; Wee have therfore nominated, 'elected, and choſen, and heirby nominats, electis, & choiſes, 'Sir Robert Dundaſs of Arneſton, ane of the Senators of the 'Colledge of Juſtice; Sir James Primroſe of Caringtoun, Sir 'Robert Dickſone of Invereſk, and George Lockhart of Carn-'wath, to be our four Commiſſioners to repreſent the ſaid 'ſhyre in the next enſewing Parliament and ſeverall meetings 'and ſeſſiones therof, to whom wee heirby give full power, 'warrand, and commiſſione, to compear for the ſaid ſhyre in 'the ſaid nixt Parliament and ſeverall meetings and ſeſſiones 'therof; and ther to meet, conſult, and aſſemble with the 'noblemen and others Commiſſioners for the ſhyres and roy-'all burghes of this kingdome, and to ſitt in the ſaids meetings 'and ſeſſiones of Parliament; and conferr, treate, vott, con-'ſult, and determine in all poynts, acts, and effaires, that ſhall 'happen to be debated, proponed, and concluded in the ſaids 'meetings and ſeſſiones of Parliament; and all and everie thing 'to doe therin, ſicklyk and as freelie in all reſpects, and to all 'intentis and purpoſes, as any other Commiſſioner for this 'ſhyre, or any other Commiſſioner within this kingdome hes 'done or may doe in the lyke caices. And for the mair ſecuri-'tie, we conſent thir preſents be inſert & regiſtrat in the 'bookes of Parliament, &c.' Dated 30th September 1702.

3. *Commiſſion by the Burgh of Edinburgh.*

'Be it knowen to all men be thir preſents, Us the Lord Pro-'voſt, Baillies, Council and Deacons of crafts ordinar and ex-'traordinar of the burgh of Edinburgh; foraſmuchas it having 'pleaſed the Queen's Majeſty to call a Parliament of this king-'dom to meet at Edinburgh upon the twelth day of November 'nixt enſueing the dait of thir preſents; therefor wit ye us to 'have, nominate, conſtitut, and ordained, likeas we be thir 'preſents nominate, conſtitut, and ordaine Sir Patrick John-'ſton preſent Lord Provoſt of Edinburgh, and Robert Inglis, 'goldſmith, and preſent Deacon Conveener of the incorpora-'tions thereof, to repreſent us as our Commiſſioners in the 'ſaid Parliament, giving, granting, and committing to them 'our very full, free, plain power, expreſs bidding, manda-'ment and charge, for us in our names and upon our behalf, 'to meet and conveen with the remanent Commiſſioners of the

'free royall burrows of this Kingdom in the ſaid enſueing 'Parliament, to be holden at Edinburgh the ſaid twelth day 'of November nixt, with continuation of dayes, and there in 'our names and upon our behalf to ſitt, treat, reaſon, vote, 'and conclude upon all and whatſomever maitters that ſhall 'happen to be proponed and treated upon in the ſaid Parlia-'ment; firm and ſtable holding, and for to hold all & what-'ſomever our ſaids Commiſſioners does in the premiſes, in ſo 'far as may concerne the glory of God, the Queen's honour, 'the wellfare of the kingdom, this church, and eſtate of bur-'rowes. Attour we teſtifye our ſaid Commiſſioners to be men 'fearing God, of the true Proteſtant religion preſently pro-'feſſed and authorized be the laws of this kingdom without 'ſuſpicion in the contrare; the one a merchant, the other a 'tradſman, inhabitants within this burgh, bearing all portable 'charges with their neighbours, and are ſuch as may tyne and 'win in all our affaires. In witneſs wherof, &c. &c.' Dated 11th September 1702.

No. IV. Page 24, 57.

1. *Reſolutions of a Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Louth.*

AT a numerous and reſpectable meeting of the Freeholders of the county of Louth, held at Dundalk, Monday, January 14, 1799, the following reſolutions were unanimouſly agreed to:—

John M'Clintock, jun. Eſq. High Sheriff, in the chair:

Reſolved, That it is the duty, as well as the right of the freeholders and burgeſſes of Ireland, to expreſs their ſentiments on the ſubject of a Union.

That our Repreſentatives were not empowered at their election to ſurrender the conſtitutional privileges of their conſtituents.

That the rapid improvement of this kingdom ſince the date of her legiſlative independence clearly evinces, that an independent Iriſh Legiſlature is as neceſſary as Britiſh connexion to the proſperity of Ireland.

That a Union would not only deprive us of many of our deareſt rights, but render the enjoyment of the remainder precarious and uncertain, and would for ever deſtroy the ſecurity that Ireland now poſſeſſes for their continuance.

That it is impolitic and unwiſe to agitate at this time a queſtion that may lead to a recurrence to firſt principles.

That,

That, firmly attached as we are to Britiſh connexion, we do totally diſapprove of the plan of a Legiſlative Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

That theſe our ſentiments be communicated to our Repreſentatives, in whoſe attachment to the conſtitution and true intereſts of Ireland we have the moſt firm reliance.

2. *Anſwer of the Right Hon. John Foſter, Speaker of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, on receiving the Communication of the foregoing Reſolutions.*

Gentlemen, I thank you for your ſentiments, and it is a great ſatisfaction to me to find my opinions ſtrengthened by your explicit declaration, that an Iriſh independent Legiſlature is as neceſſary as Britiſh connexion to the proſperity of Ireland. The Houſe of Commons have ſaid ſo in ſtrong language, when they ſtated to his Majeſty in 1782, that the very eſſence of our liberties exiſts in the right of a *ſole* Legiſlature—the Parliament of Ireland—a right which they then claimed on the part of all the people as their birthright, and which they declared to his Majeſty they could not yield but with their lives. I joined in that ſtatement—and we were afterwards told from the Throne that both countries had pledged their good faith to each other, that their beſt ſecurity would be an inviolable adherence to that compact; and we were deſired to convince the people that the two kingdoms were then one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of conſtitution and unity of intereſt. Nothing then remains to ſtrengthen our Union—we have adhered to that compact, ſo has Great Britain, and we have riſen to proſperity with a rapidneſs beyond example ſince it was made. I ſee no circumſtance either of imperial concern or local neceſſity, which can juſtify our attempting a change, much leſs ſuch a change as would annihilate that birthright, by the confirmation of which our trade and manufactures felt a ſecurity that immediately rouſed a happy ſpirit of exertion, the ſurrender of which would not only make the employment of thoſe exertions precarious, but would equally take away all ſecurity of permanence from every advantage which any perſons might be ignorantly deluded into a hope of from the projected meaſure of a Legiſlative Union. In truth, I ſee much danger and a probable decreaſe to our trade and manufactures, from the meaſure; and I cannot conceive any one advantage to them from it. If the linen manufacture reſts at all on any compact, that compact was made with the Iriſh Parliament, the extinction of which takes away a ſecurity we have found adequate, and leaves it without the protection of its natural guardians, who by their vigilance, their regulations, and their bounties, have more than doubled its exports within a few years paſt. As

an

an Iriſhman, then, I ſhould oppoſe the meaſure; and as a member of the empire I ſhould not be leſs averſe to it; for the innovation which it would make in the conſtitution of Great Britain, with whom we muſt ſtand or fall, may ſo endanger that conſtitution, as in the end to overturn it, and with it the whole of the empire. Nor can I look on the circumſtances of the times, without deprecating its being propoſed, when the French proceedings teach us the danger of innovating on eſtabliſhed conſtitutions, and when it muſt be peculiarly alarming to Ireland, ſcarcely reſted from a cruel and unprovoked rebellion, to have the public mind again agitated by an unneceſſary, unprovoked, and unſolicited project. Theſe are my ſentiments. The entire confidence you repoſe in my attachment to the conſtitution and the true intereſt of Ireland, call upon me to ſtate them fully to you—you ſhall not find that confidence miſplaced. I ſhall oppoſe the meaſure; and I remain, with the moſt perfect eſteem and affection,

Your very obliged and faithful humble ſervant,

Jan. 15. JOHN FOSTER.

No. V. Page 74.

An Account of the Regiſter Tonnage, belonging to the ſeveral Ports of Great Britain and Ireland, in the following Years, diſtinguiſhing ſome of the principal Ports of Great Britain.

	1793.	1795.	1797.
Liverpool —	96,694	83,175	87,093
Briſtol —	40,289	29,556	23,611
Hull —	57,891	61,494	64,477
Whitehaven —	56,415	57,187	54,925
Newcaſtle —	123,821	126,962	128,294
Sunderland —	63,015	69,997	73,505
All the other Ports of England —	756,625	779,528	820,640
Total of England	1,204,750	1,207,899	1,252,545
Glaſgow —	42,850	37,234	32,110
All the other Ports of Scotland —	116,325	108,157	104,428
Total of Scotland	159,175	145,391	136,538
Ireland —	67,790	58,765	53,181

No. VI. Page 90.

1. *Extract from the Evidence of Mr.* JOSIAH WEDGWOOD, *before the Committee of the whole House, in the House of Commons, 2d May* 1785.

THE principal raw materials of which our preſent earthen wares are made are clay and flint ſtones. The former, Ireland has of her own, and, as I am told, of the beſt quality; but if this ſhould not be ſo, ſhe has been, and therefore no doubt ſhe can be again ſupplied with it from the ſame places that we ourſelves are; and this at little more than half the expenſe which it coſts us when delivered in Staffordſhire. The latter (flint ſtones) ſhe has much cheaper ſtill; as we now fetch them for the potteries in Staffordſhire from the ſhores which ſurround Ireland.—My authorities for the exiſtence, abundance, and cheapneſs of the raw materials neceſſary for carrying on an earthen-ware manufactory in Ireland are perſons who have had ſpecimens of the clay ſent to them here for trial, and the evidence of Mr. *Evans*, engineer of the Grand Canal making acroſs Ireland, which was laid before the Iriſh Houſe of Commons in 1783.—He ſtates, that on the banks of the Grand Canal leſs than 30 miles from Dublin, 'there is flint for 'making flint ware, clays for potteries, and pipe-clay for mak-'ing Staffordſhire ware.'—We muſt likewiſe take into the account the carriage, freight, loſs by breakage, and the duties on our ware on its importation from Staffordſhire into Ireland, amounting all together to 40 per cent.—P. 177, 178.

2. *Extract from the ſame Gentleman's Evidence before the Committee of the whole Houſe, in the Houſe of Lords.*

When potteries are eſtabliſhed in Ireland, and the natives are taught that buſineſs, I apprehend that a manufacture of a ſimilar kind with what is now made in Staffordſhire may be purchaſed at 40*l.* or 50*l.* per cent. cheaper, on a moſt moderate calculation, than we can afford to ſell it in Staffordſhire.—Some of the raw materials for the finer ſpecies of earthen-ware we have ourſelves from Ireland, viz. the flint ſtone; and I am told they have the clay likewiſe of a very good quality. There are ſome tons of it now in a pottery, ſent to be tried by a perſon who lives in Ireland a great part of his time; he has a warehouſe there, and a pottery in Staffordſhire. He has ſome tons of this Iriſh pipe-clay to make a trial of. He told me before I came to London that he had tried it, and that it was very good. Theſe are the principal articles of raw material of our

manufacture.—Is the flint of Ireland equal to ours?—If you take it all together, it is not equal to ours; but it is brought to Liverpool by way of ballaſt, and there *we* employ agents to pick out ſuch as are good from the ballaſt when thrown out.—Is that which is ſo picked out as good as that of the eaſtern coaſt*? —I do not think it is, becauſe they bring it from the coaſt; and flint expoſed to the air for any time acquires a metallic quality. It comes from many parts of Ireland. There is a trace of it near Dublin, which they uſed when they ſet up a manufacture of queen's ware there.—Is there any great expenſe in ſeparating the good from the bad?—No. Any man accuſtomed to the grinding it knows directly which is good and which is bad. When their natives have learned the buſineſs in as good perfection as ours have here, I apprehend that leſs than 40*l.* or 50*l.* per cent. would ſcarcely be a protecting duty. When I ſaid the flint was not ſo good, I had reference to that which is picked up promiſcuouſly. That picked up from the Iriſh ſhore and taken to any places convenient for a pottery work, muſt be in the vicinity of water carriage. Therefore the carriage, which makes a very great proportion of the value of our raw material, at leaſt five ſixths or ſix ſevenths of the whole value, will be ſo much expenſe ſaved by taking the flint from the Iriſh ſhore and carrying it in lighters to the manufactories there; ſo that they will have the flint I might have ſaid one third, but I am ſure they might have it at one half of what it coſts us, and they may have the coal from our pits at little more than half the price, owing to our very inland ſituation.—I have made calculations upon it. The clay, when delivered on board a ſhip, uſed to be about 6*s.* or 7*s.* per ton. When it arrives in Staffordſhire, it is from 36*s.* or 38*s.* to two guineas per ton; ſo that the difference between 6*s.* per ton and the expenſe of the carriage is near two guineas†; and on that account, there being no inland carriage to Dublin, they can have it from our clay-pits at little more than half the price that we have it.—There is ſagger clay in ſeveral parts of Ireland. In almoſt every place where coal and iron ſtone are found, that ſpecies of clay accompanies it. It is along the banks of the New Canal that runs acroſs the kingdom. Mr. *Evans*, Surveyor of the Grand Canal, gave in a report to the Iriſh Parliament laſt year, in which he ſays there are coals of equal quality with the Whitehaven coals, ſufficient for the ſupply of the whole kingdom; and there is clay for potters. By which I ſuppoſe he means the coarſe kind of pipe-clay for Staffordſhire ware. And there is a canal not a great many miles from Dublin; ſo that there ſeems, in that happy ſpot, the fineſt ſituation for a potter, becauſe he has all the materials under his own hand.

P. 145. 152. 157. 160, 161.

* Query?

† Query? No.

No. VII. Page 111.

IRISH REVENUE, 1797.

	Gross. £.	s.	d.	*Nett.* £.	s.	d.
Consolidated fund	964,524	7	3⅛			
Inland excise, exclusive of appropriated duties, &c.	428,064	9	0			
Licences	75,560	11	5			
Appropriated duties	319,689	9	1			
	1,787,838	16	9⅛			
Deduct management, bounties, and other articles charged on incidents	456,035	11	5⅞			
				1,331,803	5	3⅛
Stamps	109,035	4	3			
Deduct charges	20,924	11	1¾			
				88,110	13	1¼
Post-office	68,256	6	11½			
Deduct charges	50,653	18	9			
				17,602	8	2½
Total net revenue				1,437,516	6	7½

Gross sums.			
1,787,838	16	9⅛	
109,035	4	3	
68,256	6	11½	
1,965,130	8	0⅛	Total gross revenue.

No. VIII. Page 111.

SCOTCH REVENUE, 1797.

Branches.	*Gross Produce.* £.	s.	d.	*Net Produce.* £.	s.	d.
Customs	403,536	15	11	324,644	19	2¼
Excise	958,173	19	0½	827,237	17	1¼
Stamps	123,978	5	3	112,380	0	0
Land and assessed taxes	104,061	15	9	98,768	6	11
Salt	27,314	5	3¼	21,816	10	8¼
Post-office	109,793	6	4	94,810	1	10¼
1*s.* on pensions, &c.	4,136	4	9¼	3,985	15	8¼
6*d.* on pensions, &c.	3,477	9	1¾	3,392	13	7¾
Total	1,734,472	2	3¾	1,487,036	5	2¼

No. IX *.

SCOTCH REVENUE, 1798.

Branches.	*Gross Produce.* £.	s.	d.	*Net Produce.* £.	s.	d.
Customs	539,284	15	7	439,231	11	10
Excise	965,252	18	3¼	807,796	8	1¼
Stamps	140,609	15	3¼	126,727	6	6
Land and assessed taxes	209,209	17	4	205,108	13	8
Salt	59,523	9	3¾	51,782	13	6¼
Post-office	110,701	14	3	95,639	4	9¼
1*s.* on pensions, &c.	39,937	11	0¼	39,684	5	3¼
6*d.* on pensions, &c.	3,003	7	5¼	2,965	16	7¼
Total	2,067,523	8	5¾	1,768,936	0	4

* This is extracted from an account laid before the House of Commons 13th June 1799.

No.

No. X. Page 110, Note.

RATES OF POSTAGE IN IRELAND, 1797.

	Postage of a single letter s.	d.
From any poſt-office in Ireland to any place in the ſame kingdom, not exceeding 15 miles from ſuch office, and not paſſing through Dublin	0	2
Above the diſtance of 15 miles and not exceeding 30 miles, and not paſſing through Dublin	0	3
Above the diſtance of 30 miles and not exceeding 50 miles, and not paſſing through Dublin	0	4
Above the diſtance of 50 miles and not exceeding 80 miles, and not paſſing through Dublin	0	5
And all beyond 80 miles, and not paſſing thro' Dublin	0	6
Between Dublin and London by way of Holyhead	0	8
Between Waterford and London by way of Haverford Weſt	0	8
Between Donaghadee and London by way of Portpatrick	1	3

No. XI. Page 110, Note.

RATES OF POSTAGE IN SCOTLAND, 1797.

	Poſtage of a ſingle letter s.	d.
Between London and Edinburgh, Dumfries, or Cockburnſpeth	0	8
From any poſt-office in Scotland to any place not exceeding one ſtage from ſuch office	0	3
From any poſt-office in Scotland, to any place in the ſame kingdom, above one ſtage, and not exceeding 50 miles, and not paſſing through Edinburgh	0	4
From any poſt-office in Scotland to any place in the ſame kingdom above 50 and not exceeding 80 miles, and not paſſing through Edinburgh	0	5
From any poſt-office in Scotland to any place in the ſame kingdom above 80 and not exceeding 150 miles, and not paſſing through Edinburgh	0	6
From any poſt-office in Scotland to any place above 150 miles, and not paſſing through Edinburgh	0	7
Between Port-patrick in Scotland and Donaghadee in Ireland, by packet-boats, over and above all other rates	0	2

Letters

Letters to and from any part of England and any part of Scotland, not paſſing through London, Edinburgh, Dumfries, or Cockburnſpeth, are not chargeable, if ſingle, higher than —— 0 8

No. XII. Page 117.

Extract from Craig De Feudis.

SED de Parliamentis hoc unum monuiſſe ſufficiat, nihil ratum eſſe, nihil legis vim habere, niſi quod omnium trium ordinum conſenſu conjuncto conſtitutum eſt; ita tamen ut uniuſcujuſque ordinis per ſe major pars conſentiens pro toto ordine ſufficiat. Scio bodie controverti, an duo ordines Parliamenti, diſſentiente tertio, quaſi major pars, leges condere, onera ſive realia ſive perſonalia imponere, ſtatuta nova introducere poſſint, cujus partem negantem boni omnes, & quicunque de hac re ſcripſerunt, pertinaciſſime tuentur, alioqui duo ordines in everſionem tertii, poſſunt convenire. Quod de everſione dixi, idem de præjudicio & incommodo intelligendum.

No. XIII. Page 123.

Extract from Sir William Petty's Political Anatomy of Ireland.

IF all men were bound to ſpend the proceed of their land on the land itſelf; then as all the proceed of Ireland ought to be ſpent in Ireland, ſo all the proceed of one county in Ireland ought to be ſpent in the ſame; of one barony in the ſame barony; and ſo pariſh and manor; and at length it would follow, that every eater ought to avoid what he hath eaten upon the ſame turf where the ſame grew. Moreover, this equal ſpending of wealth would deſtroy all ſplendour and ornament; for if it were not fit that one place ſhould be more ſplendid than another, ſo alſo no one man ſhould be greater or richer than another; for if ſo, then the wealth—ſuppoſe of Ireland, being perhaps 11 millions, being divided amongſt 1,100,000 people, then no one man having above 10*l.* could probably build a houſe worth perhaps 3*l.*, which would be to leave the face of beggary on the whole nation; and with all ſuch parity, would beget anarchy and confuſion.—P. 84, 85.

FINIS.

PRINTED BY S. GOSNELL, LITTLE QUEEN STREET, HOLBORN.

136 Regalia

ERRATA.

P. 29. l. 12. After the word *one* insert *member.*
P. 65. l. 9. After the word *country* insert a comma.
Ibid. l. 10. After the word *time* dele the comma.
P. 99. l. 2. After the word *Speech*, for *of* read *on.*
P. 114. Note, l. 1. for *Keogh's authentic*, &c. read *Keogh; Authentic*, &c.
P. 130. l. 8. for *life* read *days.*
P. 152. l. 4 from the bottom, for *overawing* read *overturning.*